THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXVI, No. 3 MARCH, 1957

CONTENTS

The National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception
Thomas J. Grady 145

Portrait of a Theologian: Edmund Dublanchy
Stephen Duffy, S.M., and Thomas Gilbride, S.M. 155

The Blood of the Covenant . . . *Edward F. Siegman, C.PP.S.* 167

The Forbidden Fruit . . . . . *Bernard J. Lefrois, S.V.D.* 175

Catholics in Colonial America. Part III . . . . *John Tracy Ellis* 184

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and Walter J. Schmitz, S.S.

The Pastor and Invalidly Married Parishioners 197

Marriage with Doubtful Impotence 198

The Recipient of an Anonymous Letter 199

A Vow as an Aid to Chastity 200

Blessing with Simple Sign of the Cross 200

Candles at Side Altars or Shrines 201

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1957 by the Catholic University of America Press

(Contents Continued from Preceding Page)

Distribution of Holy Communion 202
Communion Plate and Cloth 202
Breviary Difficulties 203
Biretta Worn at Mass 204

ANALECTA

Review of Recent Roman Documents
Romaeus W. O'Brien, O.Carm. 205

BOOK REVIEWS

The Catholic Church, U.S.A., *edited by Louis J. Putz, C.S.C.* 209
Ordination to the Priesthood, *by John Bligh, S.J.* 212
Worship and Work, *by Colman J. Barry, O.S.B.* 213
Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae. Vol. III, *by Francis Xavier de Abárzuza, O.F.M.Cap.* 214

BOOK NOTES 215

Institute of Spiritual Theology

Sixth Summer Session

July 8 to August 1

DOMINICAN HOUSE OF STUDIES

River Forest, Illinois

An integrated course in spiritual theology and allied subjects for the spiritual director offered to all priests and professed brothers by a staff of Dominican Theologians.

Full course complete in three summer sessions.

Limited accommodations for resident students.

For information and prospectus write to

Father T. M. Sparks, O.P.,
Dominican House of Studies,
River Forest, Illinois.

THE NATIONAL SHRINE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

In the District of Columbia, some distance north and east of the great domed Capitol of the United States and its surrounding splendid memorials and from the monumental Government buildings, in a district given over mainly to religious houses and the campus of The Catholic University of America, at the head of Fourth Street, overlooking Michigan Avenue and paralleling Harewood Road, there looms a structure of impressive proportions.

The visible structure is a huge rectangle of wooden scaffolding covering an area half again as big as a football field. The tawny honeycomb rises some eighty feet in the air, with a central utility tower reaching up another twenty feet. South, east, and west, back from the scaffolding, across a moat of mud, like minor and often breached fortifications, are deposits of tile, brick, stone. The tiles and bricks are piled in long walls six feet high and from five to twenty feet across. The more elegant stone blocks are piled more carefully. Blocks similar in size and shape are laid together. Carved capitals or ornamented blocks lie alone or in small groups. On the near-white stone, on each piece, painted in black there is an identifying number. To the west there is a phalanx of low frame construction buildings, each bravely flying a tin chimney.

About seven o'clock each morning, cars curve out of the swirling traffic of Harewood or Michigan and fall into slots along the walls of waiting materials. More than two hundred men scatter across the area. Soon, in the honeycomb, here and there men can be seen at work. The staccato of air hammers blends with rasping voice of the cement mixer. Blue smoke trails from the frame offices. Men with paper cups of coffee in hand stand and look with sleepy and speculative eyes at the intricate shape before them. Blue prints are trailed from place to place, frowned at, argued over. Voices mingle, mostly urgent voices, but in the common, over-all sound, remote and meaningless.

The great crane drops its prehensile cable down some hundred feet and lifts away from two men a great numbered block of stone. Slowly the white stone rises against the blue-gray sky, strangely free and light. It settles down eighty feet in the air with fascinating accuracy precisely between two other stones. It is now a part

of the upper wall of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.

The cornerstone for the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception was laid on Sept. 23, 1920. Just a few months before his death, at one of his last public appearances, Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore officiated at this ceremony. Cardinal O'Connell of Boston was also present, as were eleven archbishops, fifty-six bishops, many priests, diplomatic representatives from twenty-four countries, and about six thousand other lay persons.

The placing of the foundation stone, however, was far from the first act of what has proved to be the extended drama of the National Shrine. As early as 1913, Bishop Thomas Shahan, rector of The Catholic University of America, made an appeal for funds to the Catholic Women of the United States in favor of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. In January of 1914 a small bulletin called *Salve Regina* was issued to inform the public of the steps being made toward the realization of the National Shrine.[1] In May of 1914 Cardinal Gibbons presented Bishop Shahan to Pope St. Pius X in order that the Bishop might seek the Pope's blessing upon the projected work. The Pope approved of the project, imparted his blessing to those who would help in it, and gave a cash donation of four hundred dollars toward the erection of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. In this modern day of the anemic dollar, a donation of four hundred dollars might seem modest. An idea, however, of its relative value can be derived from a consideration of a donation made Feb. 11, 1916, of two hundred dollars which was the group offering from the Diocesan Union of the Holy Name Society of Brooklyn and Long Island.

In a letter dated July 8, 1914, Pope St. Pius X wrote to Cardinal Gibbons:

> How highly We esteem this project We need not say, since nothing could be more useful to the Church or further more helpfully the welfare of the Republic. . . .

---

[1] The National Shrine bulletin, *Salve Regina,* has been published steadily since 1914—42 years. And since 1920 the National Shrine has been mailing out Christmas cards for sale. (Possibly the first in this now crowded market.) These two humble and doughty projects have done very much to publicize the hope for a National Shrine and to gather funds for it.

In this way will arise a masterpiece of religious architecture which will lift heavenward the minds of every student who enters it, make him thirst for wisdom from above, fill his heart with the same, and preserve it religiously while he lives.

The sentiments of this letter were to be echoed later by letters of Pope Benedict XV and Pope Pius XI. Especially the letter of Pope Benedict XV is explicit and impressive in its urgent desire for the erection of a National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception.

In part the letters read:

Pope Benedict XV (April 10, 1919):

We made known to you also how deeply We rejoice to hear that popular devotion to Mary Immaculate has greatly increased in view of the proposal to build on the grounds of the University the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. This most holy purpose merited the approval and cordial praise of Our Predecessor of happy memory, Pius X. We, too, have always hoped that at the earliest possible date there would be built in the National Capital of the great republic, a temple worthy of the Celestial Patroness of America. . . .

We hope that to this great church as to their own special sanctuary will come in ever greater numbers, moved by religion and piety, not only the students of the University, actual and prospective, but also the Catholic people of the whole United States. O may the day soon dawn when you, Venerable Brethren, will rejoice at the completion of so grand an undertaking! Let the good work be pushed rapidly to completion and for that purpose let everyone who glorifies in the name of Catholic contribute more abundantly than usual to the collections for this church, and not individuals alone, but also all your societies, those particularly, which by their rule, are bound to honor in a special way the Mother of God.

His Holiness goes on to promise:

To set an example . . . We shall send to Washington an image of the Immaculate Conception made by Our command in the Vatican Mosaic workshop. . . .

Our human society, indeed, has reached that stage in which it stands in most urgent need of the aid of Mary Immaculate. . . .

Pope Pius XI (April 25, 1922):

We, like our Predecessors of happy memory Pius X and Benedict XV, cherish with Fatherly affection both the University and the newly planned Shrine: and we pray that this great work may soon be brought

to completion so that from it as from the seat of her loving kindness, the Virgin Mother may bestow upon all America the heavenly gifts of wisdom and salvation.

In 1915 Rev. Bernard A. McKenna from Philadelphia was appointed secretary to Bishop Shahan. He became an ardent apostle of the National Shrine and its first Director.

In April of that same year, 1915, a plaster model of the future Shrine was exhibited at the Palace of Education at the Panama-Pacific Exposition in San Francisco. The model was that of a Gothic structure designed to be set on the Campus of the Catholic University in the hollow between McMahon Hall and the Gymnasium. Both the notion of a Gothic church and of that site were later rejected. In a letter of Nov. 15, 1918, to Rev. Dr. J. F. Noll (later Archbishop Noll), Bishop Shahan states: "I favor strongly a noble Romanesque Church, after overcoming my original inclination to the Gothic."

In June of 1919, the architectural firm of Maginnis and Walsh was chosen for the erection of the proposed Shrine. Maginnis and Walsh were regarded as leading architects in the country, excelling in the field of ecclesiastical architecture. Mr. Frederick V. Murphy, professor of architecture at the Catholic University, was made associate architect in the project of the National Shrine.

Under the open sky on May 23, 1921, Archbishop Bonzano, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, celebrated a field Mass on the site chosen for the National Shrine and blessed the ground. On Sept. 23, 1920, the cornerstone was laid. Even this event, however, did not mark the true beginning of construction. It was not until December of 1921 that the architects could present a scale model of the final form of the projected building. On May 31, 1922, the contract for the building was let to the lowest of ten bidders, Charles J. Cassidy Company of Washington, D. C. Excavations were begun on Sept. 18, 1922.

The architectural style finally agreed upon for the National Shrine was a composite one, Byzantine and Romanesque. Mr. Frederick Murphy, associate architect in the project, and Mr. Eugene Kennedy, Jr., architect, believe that the considerations which diverted the planning from a Gothic structure were four: first, experience (for example St. John the Divine in New York) showed that great Gothic structures were built very slowly and

at extreme expense; second, Washington, D. C., was a classical city, its principal buildings Roman and Greek in style—hence the suitability of a Roman-Byzantine structure; third, at Mount St. Alban's in Washington, the Episcopalian cathedral, already being built, was taking the Gothic form; fourth, the influence of John Glennon, later Cardinal Glennon of St. Louis, a close friend of the architects and of Bishop Shahan. This prelate had a strong preference for Romanesque.

The aim of the architects was to achieve an original building which would be closely imitative neither of Hagia Sophia or St. Mark's, nor of St. Peter's or any other specific church. The building was to be sunk deep in tradition; yet it was not to be "just like such and such a cathedral"; it was to be distinctive, American, the United States' own National Shrine to the Immaculate Conception.

The general aim of the design was to produce by means of great mass and perfect proportion a sense of majesty and power which would be at once impressive and at the same time conducive to reverence. It was meant to be, if the term may be used, not just an ordinary church. It was meant to be an extraordinary monument which would symbolize the faith and love for Mary Immaculate of the Catholics of an entire and great nation. It was meant to rival great monuments which would stand within a few miles of it in Washington. It was meant to be worthy to be compared to churches around the world dedicated to the Mother of God.

The final design projected a lower church or crypt and an upper church. Exteriorly, the design called for a building in the form of a Latin cross. A great dome would soar over the meeting of the nave and the transepts. The nave would be long and relatively high, flanked on either side by a number of recessed chapels. A tall, slender campanile or bell tower would stand beside the building. The church would be surrounded by landscaped terraces. Three great porches would afford entrance, the main entrance from the south, with larger porches near the east and west transepts. Two additional smaller porches would give entrance to the main narthex.

The outside measurements of the projected National Shrine are: 459 feet in length by 240 feet in width at the transepts. The height

of the main roof would be 120 feet. The height of the dome to the top of the cross would be 237 feet. The outside diameter of the dome would be 108 feet. The height of the campanile to the top of the cross would be 316 feet.

Between May 31, 1922, and Oct. 6, 1931, the lower church or crypt of the National Shrine was built. The lower church is divided into two parts: the north crypt and the south crypt. The north crypt forms a single chapel, comprising a main altar and fifteen side altars. Off the north crypt is a large confessional chapel. The first public services were held in the north crypt on April 20, 1924.

The southern crypt comprises a large vestibule or concourse for pilgrims; the Memorial Hall in which marble walls and columns bear incised into tablets the names of benefactors of the Shrine; three additional chapels: a Lourdes Chapel, the others to be called the Founder's Chapel or Bishop Shahan Chapel, and the Pius X Chapel.

The mosaic reproduction of Murillo's Immaculate Conception promised to the National Shrine by Pope Benedict XV was sent to the Shrine after the death of that Pope by Pope Pius XI. The mosaic was erected in the confessional chapel off the north crypt. On Nov. 12, 1930, this mosaic was unveiled and blessed by Cardinal Dennis Dougherty of Philadelphia.

Work on the southern crypt was completed Oct. 6, 1931. When Bishop Shahan died on March 9, 1932, he was buried in the Founder's Chapel in the southern crypt. The remains of the good bishop lie in a sarcophagus in the middle of a solemn marbled-lined room. To the right is the chapel of St. Pius X.

With the completion of the southern crypt in 1931, the gigantic foundations for the enormous upper structure had been laid and the lower church was in its chief ecclesiastical areas complete. Exteriorly, the crypt presented a picture of acute incompleteness. The exterior walls rose some fifteen feet from the ground and ended with uniform abruptness. A flat wooden roof was laid over the structure and sealed with roofing paper and water-proofing materials. Seminarians who daily passed the National Shrine on their way to class at the University dubbed the exterior the "flat-top"—the flight-deck of a great and much submerged carrier.

Within the "flattop" there was much richness, especially in the northern crypt. The north crypt has the shape of a Greek cross.

Three arms of the cross are formed by three apses. The fourth arm is a nave only a little longer than any of the apses. In each apse there are five shallow chapels or altar places recessed five feet into a Roman arch. Behind each chaste marble altar there glows a golden mosaic: a saint and proper symbols against a background of gold. The soffits on the arch above the altars are deep blue. The floor of the north crypt is marble, patterned in places with simple geometric designs.

The room is relatively low having an average height of twenty feet and six inches. It is designed to convey the feeling that it is subterranean, to catch the atmosphere of the catacombs, to draw the worshipper back to the beginnings of the Christian era. Because of the tremendous weights they are to bear from the upper church, the arches of the crypt are of massive proportions and patent strength. Along the walls are heavy, load-bearing marble columns from all over the world. On the capitals of the columns, in relief, are phrases from the Magnificat and the Litany of Loreto.

The stations of the cross are of ceramic tile. On the ceiling there are ceramic tile medallions and symbolic ornaments. The tiles were executed by Mrs. Mary Chase Stratton of Detroit from 1926 to 1927. The mosaics in the crypt are the work of Bancel La Farge, brother of the more famous architect and painter, John La Farge. Fifteen lunette windows appear in the "chapels." They are the work of C. Connick of Boston.

The focal point and crowning beauty of the northern crypt is the main altar. It stands in the center of the room. The ribs of four powerful arches meet above it. At this juncture a great square tile on the ceiling depicts the overshadowing Holy Spirit. Beneath the Dove, on a platform of travertine marble three steps high, the altar is a simple block of golden Algerian onyx—a block of great weight yet giving the impression of softness, of subdued but compelling beauty. Onyx statues of Christ, the twelve apostles and St. Paul appear in niches around the altar. The main altar is dedicated to our Lady of the Catacombs and is called the "Mary" altar, gift of all the Marys of America through the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae.

Pilgrims from all over the country and from all over the world found their way into the crypt, said their prayers to Our Lord and to His Blessed Mother, admired what they saw and guessed

at the future. Solemn functions were held in the crypt—regular Masses, University commencements and patronal feast, anniversary of the Pope's coronation, the Church Unity Octave, a May Novena. Many ordinations took place in the crypt.

Still, the National Shrine was not completed. For almost twenty-five years, the standard local anecdote was that of the tourist standing a few feet from the "flattop," having in mind a photograph of the architect's final dream, and asking "Where is the National Shrine?"

In June 1949, Msgr. John J. Reilly, then Director of the National Shrine, writing in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* reported that in 1946 at the annual meeting of the bishops of the United States, the Hierarchy had voted to implement the completion of the National Shrine. The plan to be followed was that of having a collection each year for five years in every parish of the country on Mother's Day. In two years about one million eight hundred thousand dollars had been collected. Msgr. Reilly pointed to the hope that, since the response of the faithful had been encouraging, an even more intensified effort for funds was planned for the Marian year of 1954.

Particularly under the inspiration of Archbishop Noll of Fort Wayne, in 1953 the bishops of the country organized a very well thought out program to be pursued especially during the Marian Year. Each bishop pledged a certain sum. The goal was to raise the fund for the erection of the National Shrine to fourteen million dollars. The Marian Year Drive began with a nationwide collection on Sunday, Dec. 6, 1953.

The response to the Marian Year drive was such that, although not all pledges were yet realized, the bishops were able to authorize the signing of a contract on Nov. 9, 1954, with John McShain, the well-known Philadelphia contractor, for an expenditure of over twelve million dollars for the completion of utility areas in the crypt and the erection of the superstructure of the church. It was estimated that during the time construction was under way, the entire quota would be fulfilled. Thus the cost of the contract could be met and something over a million dollars would be available for work to be supplied under ancillary contracts.

The architect of the National Shrine was still the firm of Maginnis and Walsh. The firm was now known as Maginnis and Walsh and Kennedy. Mr. Walsh had been dead for some years. Mr.

Maginnis was in his eighty-seventh year (he died Feb. 15, 1955) and Mr. Eugene F. Kennedy, Jr., F.A.I.A., was now the chief architect. From 1926 to 1941 Mr. Kennedy was chief designer of the firm of Maginnis and Walsh. In 1941 he was made a member of the firm, and in 1954 the title of the firm was changed to include his name.

The new contract covers two areas: the addition of a service area to the crypt; secondly, the erection of the superstructure of the church. The crypt is to be extended southward into an area that will lie below the main entrance and narthex. In the new area there will be a cafeteria, a souvenir and religious art shop, offices and storage space. In the erection of the superstructure four large chapels, two on each side of the nave, are being omitted until a later date. The campanile will not yet be built. The west sacristy is omitted. The floor will be finished in marble. Pews will be installed. The main altar will be in place. But no other interior work will be done. The construction presently under way is expected to be finished in 1959.

At the completion of the present work there will still remain to be realized: the four side chapels, the bell tower, the west sacristy, finishing the interior walls with marble, altars and mosaics for the fifteen apsidal "chapels," interior finish for five other chapels, colored glass for some one hundred and thirty windows, many altar appointments and vestments. Maintenance of the existing structure will, of course, be a consideration.

A week after the contract had been signed, on Nov. 15, 1954, Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle officiated at a simple ceremony, marking the resumption of work and calling God's blessing upon the new undertaking. Engineers and lay-out men began their work at once. On May 3, 1955, work was begun on the first of the construction offices. This office was occupied May 16, 1955; during the summer of 1955 work on the superstructure gradually began. Since the fall of 1955 work has proceeded at a steady rate.

The walls of the superstructure south, toward the main entrance, rise to a height of about fifty-five feet. At the northern end, in the area of the apses, the walls are about eighty feet high. The east sacristy is roofed over; the extreme northern wall is at the roof line. On that northern wall a bas-relief of Mary, Queen of the World, is now being carved, with Ivan Mestrovic as the sculptor. On the east and west transepts the porches are under construction.

And above them, on each side, like new moons are first signs of the frames for two rose windows.

It is hoped that in a future article some of the details of this beautiful new structure may be described.

THOMAS J. GRADY

National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for March 1907, written by the editor, Fr. H. Heuser, is entitled "The Tenebrae and the New Light of the Holy Fire." The author develops the theme that the extinguishing of the lights at the Tenebrae service symbolizes the death and burial of Christ, the Light of the World, while the kindling of the new fire on Holy Saturday reminds us of the conquest of darkness through His resurrection. We are told that in medieval England the kindling of the new fire took place on each of the last three days of Holy Week. . . . Darley Dale, of Stroud, England, contributes an interesting article on a pre-Reformation English theologian, John Myrc (dates not given), an Augustinian Canon, who wrote in rhythmic form a compendium of practical theology entitled *Instruction for Parish Priests.* We are informed that in those days the prescribed penance for a mortal sin was "to fast on bread and water every Friday and to abstain every Wednesday for seven years." . . . Dom H. Feasey, O.S.B., also an English writer, contributes an historical account of the paschal candle and the *Exultet.* . . . Chapter VII of *A Clerical Story of Sixes and Sevens* is an appeal for Gregorian chant. . . . A discussion by Father Heuser on the problems "What are the Disestablished Priests in France going to do?" informs us that in France, since the disestablishment of the Church, there are fifty thousand priests without income or home. The editor's answer to the problem is that these priests "must get into the hearts of the people, not simply by dripping Catholic doctrine and edifying illustrations of Catholic devotion into the minds of the faithful from the pulpit, but by going into their midst, living with them and getting their living from them, by preaching to them, not only in the catechism class but in the marts, railways, workshops, etc.". . . A commentary on the "working men's indult," which granted a dispensation from abstinence on certain days to working men and the members of their families, takes a generous interpretation of those included in the category of "working men."

F. J. C.

PORTRAIT OF A THEOLOGIAN: EDMUND DUBLANCHY

The theologian is more than a diarist of the Church's beliefs. For under the leadership of the living Magisterium he not only records her teachings but is assigned "the great duty of investigating the Deposit of Faith thoroughly, of examining well and explaining the nature and interrelations of the individual truths according to the norms of sacred doctrine."[1]

It is beyond question, then, that his training is a grave responsibility, and one the Church watches with jealous maternal concern. Her doctors are molded only in academies bearing special approval.

The Catholic University of America's School of Sacred Theology is one of these sanctioned centers of learning. Its short history has supplied the Church in the United States with a good number of theological specialists. The institution's doors were first opened in the year of the centennial celebration of the establishment of the American hierarchy, 1889. It did not have an easy birth; for it issued from a religious and political turmoil within Catholic circles and lived its infancy in the near-same environment. Strong differences of opinion and oversensitive dignity circulated among some of the nation's episcopate and their satellites on the faculty. The "School Question," a controversy pivoting on the state's role in the education of its subjects; the "German Question," a delicate issue pitting Americanizing against Germanizing elements; and "Americanism," a complex problem concerned with the adaptation of the Catholic Church to the national scene (and not without its theological, political and practical ramifications) . . . these were the explosive ingredients giving rise to much unrest within the American Church. Factions were set up, following party lines, with mutual name-calling and "reports" to Rome. But despite this atmosphere of alternating hot and cold warfare, courses were being presented and degrees conferred.[2]

[1] Pope Pius XII, *Inter complures, AAS,* XLVI (1954), 678.

[2] For an accurate and interesting account of the University's turbulent early years: Ellis, J. T. *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1946); Ahearn, P. *The Catholic University of America, 1887-1896* (Wash-

June of 1895 saw the first bestowal of the doctorate in sacred theology. Two candidates were presented: Rev. George J. Lucas of the diocese of Scranton and Rev. Edmund Dublanchy of the Marist Fathers. Ceremonially, the occasion was a notably impressive one. The Apostolic Delegate to the United States, Archbishop Francesco Satolli, bestowed the degrees and the dean of the faculty of theology, Dr. Thomas O'Gorman, delivered the address. Speaking to the two graduates, O'Gorman said:

> This new honor is a talent not to be wrapped up in a napkin, not to be buried in idleness and inactivity; but to be used so that you may deserve the Master's further commendation: *Supra multa te constituam.* There open up before you, if you but remain true and loyal to your beginnings, a duty and a career of great usefulness. Look at the Church's life as displayed in her history, and you shall see what an important and noble part has been acted by her doctors. I do not refer to those few great men who, in addition to supereminent sanctity, have received from the Universal Church the sublime title of Doctor; nor do I refer to those who, in virtue of their office, are the authentic doctors of the Church—Pope and bishops; but I refer to those like yourselves who after trial have been found worthy to be set up among the faithful and the clergy as teachers, masters, and doctors. They in all ages, while they remained subject and loyal to the Church's authority, the Pope and bishops, have been the strong bulwark of the Church, the authorized expounders of her teachings, the born defenders of her position, the picked body of her valiant and devoted Janissaries.[3]

Father Edmund Dublanchy spelled out in his own life the fulfillment of O'Gorman's injunction. He did not allow the "talent" to be wrapped in a napkin of inactivity. A dedicated theologian, he could never divorce himself from the queen of sciences. Rarely did he hold a conversation without seasoning it with a moral or dogmatic question; not forever preaching but always injecting into a topic a theological implication. So evident was this that one of his pupils could complain: "There is nothing he enjoyed more than a theological discussion. He reveled in it. . . . He enjoyed the com-

---

ington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948); Hogan, P. *The Catholic University of America, 1896-1903* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949); Ahearn, P. *The Life of John J. Keane* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1955).

[3] *The Catholic University of America Bulletin,* I (1895), 463.

pany of the students; often spent his recreations with us and even joined us in our weekly hikes, mostly to enjoy a theological discussion, until most of us got fed up with that rich diet."

While his works might not be called voluminous, their breadth, depth, and the standards of the literature in which they appeared give ample indication of his ability and scholarship. Dublanchy contributed thirty-seven articles (consisting of near 900 columns) to the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique:* treating such major topics as *Église, Marie, Infaillibilité, Morale (Théologie), Dogme, Dépot de la Foi, Ascétisme, Décalogue;* articles to the *Revue thomiste* and *La vie spirituelle.* A bibliography of his important writings is given at the end of this article.

The following is an album of verbal snapshots of Father Dublanchy's life. It is presented to pay tribute to the memory of a loyal and devoted son of the Church, to the Alma Mater whose first-born he was and to give those who consult his articles in the D.T.C. a brief biographical account of the author.

Edmund Dublanchy was born January 21, 1858, at Bruville, France, in what is now the diocese of Nancy. His theological studies were made at the diocesan major seminary. Shortly after his ordination to the diaconate, he found himself possessed of the desire to enter the religious life. Wish became reality upon his entrance into the Society of Mary. Caught up in the civil strife of the nineteenth century, the young Marist aspirant was forced by reason of the anti-clerical decrees of the 1880's to leave his native soil and embark for Ireland. There he completed his year of canonical novitiate, binding himself on October 1, 1881, to the service of God under the aegis of Mary through the ceremony of religious profession. The following day his hands were anointed with the holy oils of ordination. The sacred rite took place at Armagh, Bishop Daniel McGettigan being the ordaining prelate.

Immediately after ordination the young priest was assigned to teach in the Marist Scholasticate at Dublin. Dublanchy's superiors were quick to perceive the promise of theological scholarship. As later events were to prove, their confidence was not ill-placed. Between 1881 and 1892 he lectured in philosophy, Scripture, and dogmatic theology at various Marist major seminaries in Ireland, England, Spain and the United States. Undoubtedly such a broad teaching experience in so many different countries would later

prove invaluable preparation for the man who was to take his place among the theological writers of the time.

In 1890 Dublanchy came to America to help staff a house of studies which his society had but recently established at Dodon, Maryland. It was while teaching here that he engaged in graduate work in the nascent school of theology at Catholic University. From 1891 to 1895 Father Dublanchy attended the classes of Thomas Bouquillon, Joseph Schroeder, Henry Hyvernat, Sebastian Messmer, Thomas O'Gorman, George Peries, all of whom loomed large in the colorful and turbulent history of the University in its early years. These "formative years" found the institution's very existence called into question by competitive interests. The so-called "Americanism" was in the air. The School Question, too, was a burning issue which marshalled liberal against conservative and divided the University's theological faculty with Bouquillon and O'Gorman closing ranks on one side against Schroeder, Pohle and Messmer on the other. Nor was the "German Question" without devastating influence on the school at this time.

On June 20, 1895, at the close of the University's sixth scholastic year the doctorate in sacred theology was conferred on Dublanchy. He had the privilege of reading Pius IV's Profession of Faith on this occasion. Prior to this the candidate had undergone a grueling six-hour public defense of his dissertation in the presence of the following famous personages: Archbishop Satolli, Apostolic Delegate at the time, Msgr. Donatus Sbaretti,[4] Dr. Frederick Z. Rooker, secretary to the Delegate, Fr. Aloysius Sabetti, the Jesuit moralist, Rene Holaind, Fathers James Smith, S. J., and Albert Stern, C.SS.R.

Dublanchy's thesis dealt with the theological significance of the sensitive axiom: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. In the first part of his treatise he establishes the universal salvific will of God; in the second he deals with the principal means of salvation—Faith, Grace and the Sacraments; in the third he proves that these means have been entrusted to the Church, to which, therefore, all must belong

[4] In 1916 Sbaretti was made a cardinal-bishop. He served as Apostolic Delegate to Canada, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, Secretary of the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office and Camerlengo. He died in 1939.

who wished to be saved.[5] His treatment closes with an exposition of the axiom from the historical, theological and apologetical points of view. At that time Bouquillon, in a review of his student's book, had this to say: "the work of Dr. Dublanchy is one of durable value, and betrays, in general, much painstaking research, accuracy and liberal theological culture."

Two years later, Dublanchy, who had been teaching dogmatic theology at the Marist Scholasticate in Brookland, Washington, D. C., was recalled to France. Between 1897 and 1910 he was professor of moral in his congregation's seminaries at Montbel[6] and Moulin. This latter experience further broadened the theological horizons of one who had heretofore specialized in dogmatic theology. It was during this period, too, that Dublanchy began his career as a theological writer, contributing at this time more than 25 scholarly articles to the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* under the editorship of Jean Vacant. Most of these articles bear upon involved questions. They are fairly long, well documented, temper-

[5] At a time when there was much confusion in some quarters as to what constituted actual membership in the Church, Dublanchy had the insight to lay down the following three requisites: (1) Baptism, (2) full profession of the Catholic Faith as taught by the Church and (3) full submission to legitimate ecclesiastical authority. Pope Pius confirmed this view in his *Mystici Corporis* (*AAS*, XXXV, 201 ff.) *DB* 2287. Dublanchy also disapproved of calling non-Catholics in good faith "invisible members of the Church who belong to the *soul* of the Church." To his mind, all such manner of speaking was to be shunned. Cf. *Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus* (Barri-Ducis: Contant-Laguerre, 1895), pp. 364-73 for a remarkably clear exposition. Even Franzelin and Mazzella were not clear on this point: Franzelin, J., *Theses de Ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Propaganda Fidei, 1887), th. 23; Mazzella, C., *De Religione et Ecclesia* (Rome: Propaganda Fidei, 1885), n. 492. Another striking aspect of Dublanchy's thesis is that it came forth at a time when certain parties within the university were alledgedly compromising Catholic teaching concerning the Church as the sole means of salvation.

[6] It was at this Marist house of studies that John Ireland, the first Archbishop of St. Paul, and Thomas O'Gorman, professor of theology at Catholic University and later Bishop of Sioux Falls, received their philosophical and theological training. Bishop Crétin, the first bishop of St. Paul, a classmate of Father John Colin, founder of the Society of Mary, responded to the latter's generous offer to educate, free of cost, the levites of his missionary diocese. Cf. Reardon, J., *The Catholic Church in the Diocese of St. Paul* (St. Paul: North Central Publishing Co., 1952), pp. 215-18.

ate in language and presentation, giving evidence of "liberal theological culture."

From 1910 to 1913 Dublanchy was stationed near Turin where he served as *socius* to the master of novices. No doubt the student in him found this assignment a real blessing, for, relieved of the burdens of the classroom, he found more time for study and research. In 1911 eight more of his articles were incorporated into the corpus of the D.T.C., *Eglise* and *Dogme* being the most important of his contributions to this fourth volume of the set. The brief span from 1913 to 1914 found Dublanchy at the Marist International Scholasticate in Rome.

The next few years were to prove trying for him, as they did for so many others. For some time now clouds of war hung ominously over Europe. In the summer of 1914 war broke loose. The outbreak of the conflict occasioned Dublanchy's return to Bruville, his home town, there to replace the curé who had been conscripted. Later, in May of 1916, the Germans arrested the substitute pastor on suspicion, of all things, of espionage.[7] He was taken to Metz, then to Cassel and finally to Munich. The greatest trial at this time was not the enervating captivity, but rather the confiscation of several manuscripts which had been the end result of hours of laborious research. During this confinement, the theologian-prisoner vowed to compose a treatise in honor of the Blessed Virgin in the event that he should recover his lost work. He further promised Our Lady that if he were released he would recite a thousand rosaries.

In August of the same year, after pleas for release had fallen on deaf ears, Dublanchy's hope seemed to lie in having the Apostolic Nuncio to Germany intervene. The papal representative at that time was Msgr. Frühwirth, former general of the Dominicans and Cardinal-to-be, who resided at Munich.[8] This course of action proved efficacious, for the Nuncio's advocacy on his behalf brought freedom and the return of his manuscripts. Mary had fulfilled her part of the bargain. Now it was the released captive's turn to make good his promises. The article *Marie* which appeared in the ninth

[7] Cf. Voisine, G., "Dublanchy," *Catholicisme,* III (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, col. 1134).

[8] Frühwirth, as Cardinal, later served in the Holy Office, the Congregation of Sacred Rites and as Major Penitentiary. He died in 1933.

volume of the D.T.C. in 1926 was the germ of the Mariological work which he had vowed to author. This Marian essay, perhaps the best known of his literary labors, ran some 135 columns of the small and compact print so irritably familiar to readers of the *Dictionnaire.* As to the promised chaplets, one of his confreres has humorously remarked that after the close of the war, it was not unusual to find the former "spy" fingering his beads during his free moments.

From the time of his release until 1923 Dublanchy resided at Rome. Three studies came from his pen and made their appearance in the new publication *La vie spirituelle.* The first of these focused on Mary as the model and principal of perfection; the second exposed the degrees that may exist in Marian devotion; while the third was an investigation of Our Lady's role as Mediatrix in relation to the spiritual life. During this time two of his monographs were published by the *Revue thomiste.* The first, consisting of five installments, is an exposition of the author's views on papal independence in the temporal order. Papal primacy as evidenced in Christian tradition during the first four centuries forms the subject matter of the second lengthy monograph. In 1922 the seventh volume of the D.T.C. came from the presses containing Dublanchy's contribution *Infaillibilité du Pape,* a sober analysis of the intricate dogma of Papal infallibility, but not without the seasoning of the author's own personal opinions.[9] In the course of his Roman sojourn he went often to visit and discuss matters theological with Edward Hugon, the renowned Dominican theologian.

A new appointment in 1923 brought about his return to Turin where he again held the position of *socius* to the Master of novices, a duty he fulfilled until 1925. Here, research was concretized when

[9] Dublanchy's position owes its genesis to the ground-breaking thought of Vacant, who held that the Pope was infallible in his ordinary magisterium. Yet Dublanchy's stand does not seem as broad as Vacant's. It would seem closer to the opinion of Billot who held that the Pope can speak infallibly without speaking *ex cathedra.* Cf. Billot, L., *De Ecclesia Christi,* 4th ed., I (Rome, 1921), 632. For a critique of Dublanchy's views and a survey of the whole problem see: Benard, E. "The Doctrinal Value of the Ordinary Teaching of the Holy Father in View of *Humani Generis,*" *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America,* 1951, pp. 78-107, and also Fenton, "The Doctrinal Authority of Papal Encyclicals," *AER,* CXXI, 2, 3 (Aug., Sept., 1949), 136-50; 210-20.

two of his articles were printed in the *Revue thomiste*. "Turrecremata et le pouvoir du Pape dans les questions temporelles" was a new exploration into the writings of Torquemada bearing on the papacy in the sphere of the temporal. In a lengthy paper entitled "Introduction a l'histoire des Dogmes et la definibilité des conclusions théologiques," Dublanchy, using an historical approach, grappled with the ever-knotty problem concerning the definability of theological conclusions.

It was in 1925 that Father Dublanchy, now in the twilight of life, made his last move. The Marist theologate at Differt, Belgium, welcomed him as a faculty member. Here he would remain till his death in 1938. Dogma, and at times moral and Scripture, were his teaching assignments. These were busy years and often hard ones for a man whose health was declining.

In 1926 his work *La voix de Pierre pour l'independence du Pape* was published bearing a letter of commendation from the then Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri, which the author had received when the substance of the work had earlier appeared in the *Revue thomiste*. Gasparri commended the author for treating the question of the Pope's temporal power "in the light of Thomistic teaching and according to the magisterial pronouncements of the Holy See. . . . and His Holiness sends His paternal congratulations for the care with which you have treated this important subject, and especially for the love you bear toward the Apostolic See." This volume appeared in the noonday of the hotly debated "Roman Question." Herein, Dublanchy turned his energies to a scrutiny of papal documents in an effort to defend the temporal independence of the Holy See: an independence *de jure* flowing from the pontifical primacy itself; an independence *de facto* proclaimed legitimate and inviolable by human law as necessary for the vital functioning of the full liberty of the Apostolic See.

When the tenth tome of the still-to-be-completed *Dictionnaire* was made available two years later, its pages carried his final contribution, *Morale (Théologie)*. Dublanchy had also been assigned the article *Pape*. In fact, the article had been completed and submitted to the editor, who at that time was Emile Amann. However, it is reported that author and editor did not see eye-to-eye on some theological points, the outcome being Dublanchy's withdrawal of the manuscript. Interestingly enough, a theologian-confrère of

Dublanchy has tagged him as "ultramontaniste." On the other hand, J. Solano, S.J., makes an observation which may be indicative of Amann's approach to papal teaching authority when he comments that the latter seems reluctant to admit papal infallibility relative to dogmatic facts.[10]

Meanwhile classwork, conferences and spiritual direction took their toll on the now aging Père Dublanchy. At the same time, he worked feverishly to develop into a full-blown Mariological treatise his earlier study for the D.T.C., *Marie*. For his mind was ever engrossed with the promise made to Our Lady during his detention by the Germans. But sickness was to stand between his wish and its fulfillment.

During the latter part of 1937 his memory began to fail. He lost all notion of time. Physicians diagnosed his ailment as "cerebral anemia," aggravated by a kidney condition. On the twenty-second of January he received the last sacraments. Despite severe exhaustion, Dublanchy's one preoccupation in this lingering illness was the completion of his Marian project. So much so that he had been dictating its content to a confrère from his sick bed. On the morning of January 25 he received Holy Communion as usual. That same day his condition became critical. His superior, perceiving that the final moment was fast approaching, summoned the community to the death bed. There, according to the custom of the Society of Mary, Dublanchy was assisted by the prayers of his fellow Marists. At two o'clock in the afternoon of the twenty-sixth, his heart filled with the desire to see in the light of the Godhead those mysteries which he had so ardently pondered in the "dark glass" of theological speculation, he passed away.

What are the characteristic tints and shades that make up the portrait of Edmund Dublanchy's personality? If we were asked to define him in one dimension it would have to be, "always the student." His room was a veritable annex to the community library; desk, bed and much of the floor space being literally covered with books and notes. Work for him was without cease, and the words "gagner du temps" formed the motif in his life of scholarship. And he lived them, carefully conserving every possible scrap of

[10] Cf., *Sacrae theologiae summa,* III (Madrid: B.A.C., 1953), n. 32; "Quaedam tamen non nimis facile accipienda sunt; hic articulus negligere videtur Romanum Pontificem etiam quoad *facta dogmatica* infallibilem esse."

time. It was this pinching of minutes which led him to make his yearly retreat for 1916 during his internment. He rigidly adhered to a fixed schedule which gave rise to misunderstandings with some of his confrères and provided an abundance of material for community jokes.

Physically he was an unhandsome man, bearing a six-foot frame, heavy-set but not obese. He was bald and, surprisingly, despite his customary austerity of life, he meticulously cared for three remaining strands of hair.

A conspicuous feature clearly evidenced in his writings is an intense devotion to the Holy See, manifested by his study of papal pronouncements in the minutest detail. Though not a giant in theological creativity, he nonetheless displayed acute skill in dealing with the ocean of available material on a particular point. His writings are stamped with a markedly impersonal style.

As a professor, his lectures were for the most part clear but somewhat cumbersome with the amount of quotations he produced. He did not care to teach moral theology, though several times obedience overcame preference. His was the speculative mind of the dogmatician. The so-called "case of conscience" was his bugbear. Somewhat irritating for him were the highly imaginary cases that only a major seminarian's mind can concoct. The student proposing the difficulty was invariably told that the question deformed the very situation it was meant to clarify. Doctor Dublanchy's favorite reply was, "C'est un cas chimérique." This is not to imply that he stifled classroom discussion. In these teacher-student frays Dublanchy exposed himself as a relentless Thomist of the Dominican persuasion. His thought pattern was extremely syllogistic, his premises always coming to climax in an explosive, *"Ergo!"* This provoked a volley of laughter from his students. The master, possessing a sense of humor, would exclaim: "If you laugh because you have conquered truth, I am very glad." All who remember him testify to his kindness and patience, especially toward his students.[11]

There can be little doubt that Dublanchy's life was the realiza-

[11] One of Dublanchy's students was Fr. Romain Butin, S.M., who later became professor of Semitic languages at The Catholic University of America and played an instrumental role in the formation of the Catholic Biblical Association of America.

tion of O'Gorman's picture of the professional theologian. He spent himself incarnating those aspirations which the Dean of the School of Sacred Theology had placed before his eyes on that June morning in 1895. For he took his place among those fathers in the household of the Faith who "in all ages, while they remained subject and loyal to the Church's authority, the Pope and the Bishops, have been the strong bulwark of the Church, the authorized expounders of her teachings, the born defenders of her position, the picked body of her valiant and devoted Janissaries."

DUBLANCHY'S WRITINGS

The American Ecclesiastical Review

"Heathen Adults and Natural Happiness After Death," XIII (1895), 426-36

Dictionnaire de théologie Catholique

Vol. I: Arno ou Arnon, 1984-85
Arnoul ou Ernulphe de Rochester, 1989
Arnoul de Lisieux, 1990
Ascétique, 2037-54
Ascétisme, 2055-77

Vol. II: Bailly, Louis, 37
Bandinus, 140
Barcos (Martin de), 390-91
Bergier (Nicolas-Sylvestre), 742-45
Bèze (Théodore de), 807-12
Bonne Foi, 1009-19
Bonnetty, A., 1019-26
Calatayud, Vincent, 1331
Calommie, 1369-76
Capital (Péché), 1688-92
Cas de Conscience, 1815-29
Casuistique, 1859-77
Charité, 2217-66
Chasteté, 2319-31

Vol. III: Coeur de Marie, 351-54
Commandements de l'Eglise, 388-93
Communion dans la foi, 419-29
Communion Eucharistique (Fréquente), 515-52
(Sous les deux Espèces), 552-72
Compensation Occulte, 601-04
Conseils Evangéliques, 1176-82
Coopération, 1762-70

Vol. IV: Décalogue, 161-76
Dépot de la foi, 526-31
Désespoir, 620-22
Dévotion, 680-85
Dimanche, 1308-48
Dogmatique, 1522-74
Dogme, 1574-1650
Eglise, 2108-2224
Vol. VII: Infaillibilité du Pape, 1638-1717
Vol. IX: Marie, 2339-2474
Vol. X: Morale (Théologie), 2396-2458

La vie spirituelle

Vol. II: "Marie, modèle et principe de la perfection," 378-85
Vol. IV: "Degrés de perfection dans la devotion à Marie," 172-84
Vol. V: "Marie Médiatrice," 321-31; 433-41

Revue thomiste

Vol. XXIII: "L'Independence temporelle du Pape, d'après la Théologie," 217 ff.; 321 ff.
Vol. XXIV: "L'Independence temporelle du Pape," 27-44; 167-90; 242-50
Vol. XXV: "Enseignement de la Tradition chrétienne des quatre premiers siècles sur la Primauté pontificale," 236-57; 349-71
Vol. XXVIII: "Turrecremata et le pouvoir du Pape dans les questions temporelles," 74-101
Vol. XXIX: "Introduction à l'Histoire des dogmes et la définibilité des conclusions théologiques," 51 ff.

Others

Extra ecclesiam nulla salus. Barri-Ducis: Contant-Laguerre, 1895
La voix de Pierre pour l'independence du Pape. Paris: Bonne Presse, 1926

STEPHEN DUFFY, S.M.
THOMAS GILBRIDE, S.M.

Marist College
Washington, D. C.

THE BLOOD OF THE COVENANT

When we study or meditate upon the Last Supper, we often ask the question: "Did the Apostles understand the words and actions of Jesus, as He instituted the Eucharist?" Was it all mystery to them when they observed that the Master was deviating from the customary Passover ritual to give them the broken unleavened bread and the cup of wine with the words: "Take, this is my body. . . . This is my blood, [the blood] of the covenant, which is being shed for many" (*Mark,* 14:22-24).[1] They could, of course, no more comprehend the mystery of the Real Presence and the Sacrifice of the Mass than we can. But they were well prepared to recognize several aspects of it, even if we suppose with an increasing number of Catholic scholars that they were fully aware of Jesus' divinity only on Easter Sunday. Their schooling included not only more than two years' intimate association with Jesus, whose miracles and words gave them each day new insights into His power and wisdom; it included centuries of revelation which pointed to Christ and familiarized the chosen people with various aspects of His mission. Recent study in the Gospels has shed brilliant light on a number of the incidents of Jesus' life by investigating their Old Testament background and discovering their inner relationships. One phrase of the words of institution which the Apostles readily recognized will illustrate the fruitfulness of this study, "my blood of the covenant."[2]

[1] Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus,* tr. Arnold Ehrhardt (New York: Macmillan, 1955), pp. 106-115, makes a strong case for the view that the earliest text of the words of institution is identical with the text of Mark.

[2] Jeremias, *op. cit.,* 132-135, casts some doubt on the originality of the word "covenant" in the Eucharistic formula. Jesus may have said simply, "This is my blood." In this case *tēs diathēkēs* would be "an early exegetical gloss which (with the help of *Exod.,* 24:8 and *Jer.,* 31:31-34) explains Jesus' atoning death as the covenant sacrifice to inaugurate the eschatological order of redemption" (pp. 134-135). He admits, however, that the gloss must have been added in the first decade after the death of Jesus, and the possibility that the word "covenant" represents Jesus' own idea. Reginald H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (Studies in Biblical Theology 12; London: SCM Press, 1954), pp. 69-72, cogently answers the objections raised to the phrase, "of the covenant," and shows that the awk-

The Vulgate text with which we are familiar inserts the adjective *novi* (from *I Cor.,* 11:25) into the formula: "Hic est [enim] sanguis meus novi testamenti . . ." (*Matt.,* 26:28; *Mark,* 14:24). St. Paul (or the tradition of the institution-words that he records) added it by way of allusion to *Jer.,* 31:31-33:

> The time is coming, says Yahweh, when I will make a *new* covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Juda. It will not be like the covenant I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand and brought them out of the land of Egypt. That covenant with me they broke, although I was their Lord, says Yahweh. But this is the covenant I will make with the house of Israel in the future: . . . I will put my law within them and write it upon their hearts, so that I will be their God and they shall be my people.

Even if textual evidence would indicate that Jesus said, "new covenant," instead of "covenant," simply, His meaning would not be different. While the Biblical adjective "new" implies a contrast with the "old," it does not mean something numerically *different.* "The new covenant does not replace the old, but rather grows out of it and is related to it as fulfilment to promise."[3] There is *organic continuity* between Sinai and the cenacle. Jesus insisted that He had not come to "destroy" the Law or the Prophets, but to "fulfill" (*Matt.,* 5:17). The chosen people broke the Sinai covenant by sin, but God did not break it. He carried it out by promising a "renewal" of the covenant in Messianic times. The promise is fulfilled in Christ.

"Blood of the covenant" could not fail to remind the Apostles of the Sinai covenant that gave birth to the people of God. Since

---

ward Greek is best accounted for on the supposition of an Aramaic original. He concludes that the "interpretative addition" represents the "mind of Jesus, if not his *ipsissima verba*" (p. 72). See also J. Coppens, "Eucharistie," *Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément* II (Paris: Letouzey, 1934), col. 1178.

[3] R. A. Harrisville, "The Concept of Newness in the New Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955), p. 74. He adds: "The announcement of Jeremiah implies that the divine purpose and plan will have their further unfolding in the form of a new covenant, hence, that the divine activity is now about to propel man and history further along towards the goal which God had planned for them from the very beginning. The element of continuity in the two covenants lies in the fact that both have their origin in and are an expression of the same divine will."

a covenant is a pact with mutual rights and obligations, the terms were formulated exactly. God freely chose the Hebrews to be His special people, in consideration of which they were to be unswervingly faithful to Him: "If you hearken to my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my special possession, dearer to me than all other people, though all the earth is mine. You shall be to me a kingdom of priests, a holy nation" (*Ex.* 19:5-f.). As the priest is intermediary between God and the people he represents, so Israel is a "kingdom of priests," intermediary between God and the rest of the nations. They alone knew the true God and hence had to offer Him the worship that other nations in their ignorance failed to give.

As examples of the laws which the covenant-people agreed to observe, the Exodus-account here includes the Decalog and the so-called "Book of the Covenant."[4] But the mere acceptance of these obligations, however solemn it might be, could not have been sufficient; a covenant must be ratified by ceremony, by sacrifices, by the shedding of blood to portray that Yahweh and His people are "blood-relatives." If there was to be community of life, it could be symbolized in Hebrew eyes only by commingling of blood.[5] We must guard against oversimplification by presuming that there was no development in Hebrew psychology. The same conceptions do not necessarily underlie the terminology of earlier and later

[4] "The present writer believes that the federation of tribes can be understood and explained only on the assumption that it is a conscious continuation and re-adaptation of an earlier tradition which goes back to the time of Moses. The covenant at Sinai was the formal means by which the semi-nomadic clans, recently emerged from state slavery in Egypt, were bound together in a religious and political community. The text of that covenant is the Decalogue." George E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955. Reprinted from *The Biblical Archaeologist* 17 [1954], 26-46; 49-76), p. 5. The Code of the Covenant (*Ex.* 20:22-23:19), which the redactor of the Pentateuch placed here to give further examples of covenant-laws, was probably promulgated by Moses just before the Israelites entered Canaan, according to H. Cazelles, *Études sur le Code de l'Alliance* (Paris: Letouzey, 1946), pp. 168-183.

[5] P. van Imschoot, *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament,* Vol. 1 (Paris: Desclée, 1954), pp. 240-241, mentions blood-rites among Arabs and other peoples, e.g., sucking blood from incisions or plunging hands into a basin of blood, that accompanied the making of covenants.

books of the Bible, however similar that terminology be. Probably the equation blood=life was established by the primitive observation that life departed when blood was shed. Even when it was realized that this equation did not take into account all the facts, the Hebrew clung to his conviction that blood is connected with the very essence of man. In the Apocalypse, for example, John sees "under the altar the souls of those who had been slain for the word of God" (6:9). By this symbolism he doubtless wants to suggest that the martyrs' death was sacrificial, united to Christ's sacrifice; hence their blood is pictured as spilled on the altar, as sacrificial blood must be spilled. But the blood is somehow the vehicle of the "soul," and that is why the "souls" of the martyrs are seen under the altar of heaven.

In evaluating the force of the Biblical statements about blood, we must also be aware of the differences between our psychology and that of the Bible. The Hebrew did not know of the body-soul dichotomy. Translations of the Bible often use the term "soul" to translate the Hebrew term *nephesh* which really is more comprehensive and complex a concept than "soul." "According to the specifically Semitic tendency to a synthetic rather than analytic conception, a man's *nephesh* is a totality with a definite stamp."[6] Hence the same term is used in contexts where we must translate differently in each case, e.g., by "will" or "appetite" or "life" or simply by the corresponding pronoun. With this background we can more accurately estimate the axiom, ". . . the [*nephesh*] of every living body is its blood . . ." (*Lev.*, 17:14). Because God is absolute Master of life, shed blood must always be offered to Him: "Since the life [*nephesh*] of a living body is in its blood, I have made you put it on the altar [i.e., offer it to God], so that atonement may thereby be made for your own lives, because it is the blood, as the seat of life [*nephesh*], that makes atonement" (*ibid.*, 17:11).

Exodus records two traditions of the ceremony that sealed the Sinai covenant, though they may be complementary rather than distinct. Both traditions include sacrifice and hence the shedding of blood. According to the "E" tradition, an altar is erected which

[6] D. T. Asslin, "The Notion of Dominion in Genesis 1-3," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 16 (1954), p. 281.

symbolizes Yahweh, and twelve pillars are set up "for the twelve tribes of Israel." Half the blood of the victims immolated is splashed on the altar, the other half is gathered into bowls. As Moses sprinkled the blood on the people, he cried out: "This is the blood of the covenant which Yahweh has made with you, in accordance with all these words" (*Ex.*, 24:8). Thus Yahweh and His people became blood-relatives, participating in a common life.

The "J" tradition describes the covenant ceremony as a "communion banquet" in Yahweh's presence. This banquet was the climax of the sacrifices in which part was offered to Yahweh (especially the blood), and part consumed by the offerers. Covenants, especially more important covenants, were often sealed by a common meal among ancient Semitic tribes. Since food gives and nourishes life, it was natural to make community of food symbolize community of life. To eat with enemies was unthinkable.[7] In the Exodus story, Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abiu, and seventy elders were invited to ascend the mountains as representatives of the entire people. There "they beheld the God of Israel," enthroned above the firmament, which "appeared to be sapphire tilework, as clear as the sky itself." It was axiomatic that no man can see God and continue to live (*Gen.*, 16:13; 32:31; *Ex.* 33:20-23 [all "J" probably]; *Judges*, 6:22; *Isaias*, 6:5). Yet here was an exception: "Yahweh did not smite these chosen Israelites. After gazing on God, they could still eat and drink" (*Ex.*, 24:9-11). There is no question, of course, of the elders' having seen the beatific vision; not even St. Paul enjoyed this privilege before death (*II Cor.*, 12:3-f.). The narrative simply wishes to describe as graphically as possible the intimacy of the covenant-people with Yahweh. Perhaps an allusion is intended to the concept of "kingdom of priests." "To see the face of God" is often used in the Old Testament of visiting God's sanctuary (*Ex.*, 23:17; *Deut.*, 16:16; 31:11; *Psalm*, 41 [42]:3). For the Israelite this worship flows naturally from the terms of the covenant.

"Blood of the covenant," therefore, as spoken over the cup at the Last Supper must have suggested to the Apostles the sacrifi-

[7] J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture*, I-II (London-Copenhagen, 1954), p. 305.

cial character of the rite that Jesus was performing. Blood that was shed had to be offered to God in sacrifice, as acknowledgement of His absolute dominion. It must also be a sacrifice of atonement (*Lev.*, 17:11), and so Matthew's addition, "for the forgiveness of sins," makes explicit what is latent in the institution formula.

The Apostles must have realized, further, that the "covenant" is now "fulfilled." What Yahweh had done on Mt. Sinai was a beginning, a first aspect of the perfect covenant-act to be realized in the future. What in a sense began amid the convulsions of Sinai is brought to its climax in the peace and intimacy of the cenacle. The people of Christ's covenant will henceforth be "*the* kingdom of priests" (*I Pet.*, 2:5-10; *Apoc.*, 1:5; 5:9-10) in virtue not of the "blood of goats and calves," but in virtue of Christ's blood (*Heb.*, 9:12).

In the third place, the covenant fulfilled must mean *community of life*. It is inaugurated by blood that is shed, like the Sinai covenant, but with the important difference that the Victim is also the "fulfillment" of the victims offered under the old dispensation. Since Jesus says, "my blood," He Himself is the victim, and shares His life with the Apostles, the representatives (like the elders of the Exodus account) of the new Israel. It is a common conviction with the Fathers and theologians that Jesus Himself partook of the sacred species.[8] By this communion He "fulfilled" the rite of spilling the blood on the altar. Again, the fact that He instituted the Eucharist at the Passover meal carries through the analogy of the banquet as the covenant ceremony. Both analogies and correspondences are evidently most perfect if we believe that it was really the body of Jesus that the Apostles ate and His blood that they drank.[9]

[8] F. Prat, *Jesus Christ: His Life, His Teaching, and His Work*, tr. J. J. Heenan (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1951), II, 276-277.

[9] Vincent Taylor in his admirable work, *Jesus and His Sacrifice: A Study of the Passion-Sayings in the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1951), pp. 114-139, has an excellent appreciation of *Mark* 14:22-25. He is embarrassed, however, by the fact that his exegesis almost involves him in transubstantiation: "If we now have regard to the saying as a whole, it becomes clear that by His action and word Jesus intends the bread to be a means whereby the disciples may participate in the power of His surrendered life. There is no suggestion of any intention to transform the bread into a quasi-material

It has often been pointed out that John, who omits the account of the institution (possibly because of an incipient *disciplina arcani*[10]), compensates by allusions in the discourse after the Last Supper (chapters 13:31 to 17), which in part, at least, is made up of words spoken on different occasions.[11] If we keep in mind the covenant-concept of the Last Supper, we can readily understand why John should record here the descriptions of the Christian's intimacy with the Blessed Trinity (*John,* 14:3, 15-17; 17:24-26). Or the touching little dialogue between Philip and Jesus: "Lord, show us the Father and it is enough for us." "Have I been so long a time with you, and you have not known me? Philip, he who sees me sees also the Father" (14:8-f.). Or finally, the sublime allegory of the vine. It also has covenant overtones. Israel of old was "the vine . . . transplanted from Egypt" (*Psalm,* 79 [80]:9; see also *Isaias,* 5:1-7; *Osee,* 10:1). Jesus is the *true* vine.[12] In John's Gospel the words "true" and "truth" consistently have a

---

or mystic 'food of the soul.' Materially, it is unchanged; spiritually, it becomes a means for the communication of life, because it is invested by Jesus with new meaning and power. The life is His own, offered for men and made available for them" (p. 124; see also pp. 122-23).

[10] Jeremias, *op. cit.,* pp. 72-87.

[11] For various views, see J. Huby, *Le Discours de Jésus après la Cène* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1942), pp. 8-10. Huby himself thinks that cc. 15-16 represent a discourse spoken by Jesus before the Last Supper.

[12] Jesus here speaks in terms of "corporate personality" which T. W. Manson describes as follows: "This term is a convenient expression of the fact that in the Semitic mind there is a constant oscillation between the conception of the social group—family, clan, tribe, nation—as an association of individuals in the plural or as a single living social organism about which one can more properly speak in the singular. Where the tendency to think of the social group as a single social organism ('one flesh') is powerful, there is often also a strong tendency to see the corporate personality as embodied or expressed in an individual. The king is apt to be thought of as embodying the corporate personality of his subjects. It is at this point that the transition from Son of man as a name for the people of the saints of the Most High to Son of man as a messianic title becomes possible" (*The Servant-Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus,* Cambridge, 1953, p. 74.) He refers to *Daniel* 7, where "Son of Man" refers to both the Messianic Israel and the Messias. Probably the same corporate personality is to be recognized in the famous Servant of Yahweh Songs in Second Isaias.

nuance of fulfillment and perfection. Christ fulfills and perfects the old covenant, uniting men to Himself as "blood" brothers and thus to the Father: "I am the true vine . . . I am the vine, you are the branches. He who abides in me, and I in him, he bears much fruit. . . . In this is my Father glorified, that you may bear very much fruit, and become my disciples" (17:1, 5, 8). And it is worth noting that it was the fruit of the vine that was chosen to be changed into "the blood of the covenant."

EDWARD F. SIEGMAN, C.PP.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE FORBIDDEN FRUIT

For some decades it has been the contention of exegetes that the first chapters of Genesis were written in a kind of literature that differed from the well-known historical narrative style of later ages, as, for instance, Caesar's Gallic Wars, Livy's works, etc. Those early chapters of mankind's history were written in a form of literature which befitted the times and the mentality of the people who wrote them. The Oriental Semite has his own ways of narrating things and of presenting historical facts, namely, in literary forms that reflect his own concrete expression of thought.

In 1948 the Biblical Commission expressly declared: "These literary forms [of the first eleven chapters of Genesis] correspond to none of our classical categories and cannot be judged in the light of Graeco-Roman or modern literary styles."[1] "These chapters relate in simple and figurative language, adapted to the understanding of a less-developed people, the fundamental truths presupposed for the economy of salvation, as well as the popular description of the origin of the human race and the Chosen People."[2]

In 1950, Pope Pius XII in *Humani generis* repeated verbally this last quotation.[3] Notice that he expressly states that the language of those chapters is figurative or metaphorical,[4] and nevertheless that they contain important historical truths concerning revealed religion.

[1] Cf. *Rome and the Study of Scripture* (5th ed., St. Meinrad's, Ind., 1953), p. 150.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *AAS,* XLII (1950), 577. *N.C.W.C.* edition, no. 39.

[4] A more careful translation is given by A. C. Cotter, S.J., *The Encyclical "Humani Generis" with a Commentary* (2nd ed., Weston, Mass., 1952), p. 45: ". . . the first eleven chapters of Genesis, although they do not properly conform to the rules of historical composition used by the great Greek and Latin historians or by the historians of our time, do nevertheless pertain to history in a true sense to be further studied and determined by exegetes . . . the same chapters contain, in simple and metaphorical language adapted to the mentality of a people of low culture, the principal truths fundamental for our eternal salvation and a popular description of the origin of the human race and the chosen people."

With regard to the sin of our first parents, it is clear from the New Testament that the sin was one of pride and disobedience (*Rom.* 5:12-19). They transgressed the revealed precept of the Lord. It is the *manner how* they transgressed that is discussed in the following pages. After the words of the Commission and of the Holy Father (given above) so clearly state that the language of *Gen.* 2-3 is simple and figurative, there is hardly any exegete of repute who insists on interpreting the tree with its fruit in the proper literal meaning of the words. Under the image of a tree with its fruit there lies a deeper truth; Adam and Eve's partaking of this forbidden fruit involves the historical fact of the fall of our first parents. But in what manner did it happen? *What was the precept* and how did they transgress it? Can that be ascertained?

The following proposal is a hypothesis which is built on the basic philosophical and psychological data involved in the temptation and fall of our first parents. It harmonizes perfectly with the Scriptural facts that are known to us from both the Old and New Testament, and it is especially in the light of the general ensemble of passages regarding man's punishment and man's redemption that this hypothesis gains weight. Further study may uncover other positive proofs in its favor. At any rate, its presentation can provoke discussion.[5]

SUPERNATURAL ELEVATION

To Adam and Eve God gave a perfect human nature (consisting of body and soul). On that nature He pronounced His blessing:

[5] When P. Mayrhofer, O.S.B., proposed this hypothesis in an article entitled, "Der Fall des Menschen" in *Theologie und Glaube,* XXVIII (1936), 133-62, it met with much opposition (see *ibid.* 724-40), even though he had clearly shown that his proposal differed entirely from that of the Protestants. But as the study of literary genres progressed, more and more began to interpret the forbidden fruit along the same lines. In 1948, J. Coppens of Louvain, in *La Connaissance du bien et du mal et la péché du paradis* (Gembloux, Duculot), came out with a similar view and considered *Gen.* 2-3 as a polemic against Canaanitic fertility and fecundity rites (p. 24). In *Eph. theol. louv.,* XXIV (1948), 402-08, he showed that this symbolic interpretation of *Gen.* 2-3 was not new, but had kept recurring from patristic times down the centuries even to the present day. Most recently, J. McKenzie, S.J., favors a like line of symbolism especially in view of the literary make-up of the chapters: "The Literary Characteristics of Genesis 2-3," in *Theological Studies,* XV (1954), 541-72 (especially 561 ff.).

"Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth" (*Gen.* 1:28). In the plan of God, Adam and Eve were to transmit this human nature (God co-operating by creating the soul), by means of a mutual giving over of their bodies (*traditio corporis*), terminating in the marital act: an act belonging to man's nature, good in itself and pleasing to God.

God also raised Adam and Eve to a higher level, by elevating them to the supernatural state through the gift of divine grace (which is the supernatural life of the soul). Thus they were children of God, endowed with supernatural faculties, and capable of positing supernatural acts, and of meriting supernatural glory. It was likewise in the plan of God that Adam and Eve were to transmit this supernatural life of grace to their offspring, presumably in the very transmission of human nature.[6]

Now, this supernatural life of grace was a free gift of God, something entirely gratuitous to human nature. In order that human nature (in Adam and Eve) might become worthy to be the instrument of so great a benefit for all mankind, it lay in the plan of Divine Providence to test our first parents. Since the object and the goal of the test are supernatural, the test itself would have to do with a command superimposed on human nature; in other words, positive divine revelation must come into question. The test would have to do with a positively revealed precept. If our first parents observed this positive divine precept, the life of grace (and original justice in general) would be insured for our first parents, and they would simultaneously become the instruments of transmitting supernatural life to their offspring along with physical life (human nature).

THE TEST IMPOSED ON ADAM AND EVE

Granted, now, the truth of the above fact, there still remains the *manner* in which God tested Adam and Eve. He could have tested them by something entirely *extrinsic* to their nature, say, for instance, the shunning of a certain place, or the abstaining from a certain fruit. He could also have tested them with something *intrinsic* to their nature, something that touched their human nature to the core. It could have been solely in the intellectual line, as foregoing certain knowledge for a given time. But since

[6] Cf. *Humani generis,* no. 36; *AAS,* XLII (1950), 576.

man's nature consists of *body and soul,* it would seem far more fitting if the test regarded the whole man. This would be the case if, while granting their human nature certain powers, God would ask Adam and Eve to abstain for a given time *from the use* of these powers, in order to prove to Him that they preferred the supernatural good to the natural good of which they were capable. To be specific, God could have commanded them to abstain for a given time from the lawful use of their generative powers, in order to prove to Him that they preferred the supernatural life (to be given instrumentally in the act of generation) to the mere physical (natural) life which their natures were capable of producing.

In other words, Divine Wisdom could have set up the ideal of virginity to our first parents, to be practiced for a certain length of time, as the test in their period of probation. In this test, they would be abstaining from something that touched the very core of their nature, something that was good in itself, something their natures inclined to (without concupiscence), and even were made for. The abstaining was merely in order to obtain a far higher blessing for that same human nature, by making it an instrument of grace; and thus human nature in its consummating act would be the privileged vehicle of supernatural life for all mankind. Having stood the test, Adam and Eve would have retained original justice and been also the spiritual parents of all mankind. In the present supposition, God did give just such an injunction.

SATAN'S INSIGHT

Satan, with the sagacity of a fallen angel, schemed how and where he could best attack this favorite creature of God, who had been given the gift of divine sonship. Somehow he had to make the first man and woman prefer the natural to the supernatural. Now, there was one point in which natural and supernatural came together. the natural as instrumental of the supernatural, and that was in the act of generation. To drag down this supreme act of generation from the sacred and exalted position which God intended it to have, Satan had to succeed in making Adam and Eve use their natural power immediately and thus disregard the positive supernatural precept of abstaining from their use for the time of probation. Their act would then be something within

their rights (according to their natures), but against the revealed precept; and hence they would forfeit the supernatural goal and reward attached to the observance of the precept. The very first generative act would then be an act of disobedience to God's command (supernaturally imposed on nature); and though that act of nature might bring forth physical life, it would of itself also generate death (sin).

Eve was surrounded with bliss and joy in paradise. All creation was subject to her. In attractive simplicity, the animals brought forth their young. How they attracted her, and how she longed to have offspring of her own! Satan saw his chance for a cunning temptation. "Why did God forbid this to you?" "No," Eve argued, "He did not forbid it outright, but only for a time and with a definite purpose." "What purpose?" And Satan continued his wiles.

Eve could not be tempted by concupiscence to anticipate the use of her generative powers, for she enjoyed the gift of integrity; so temptation could only come from without. Satan pursued his line of thought: "Why did God say you would die if you did so? Does not the evidence of your eyes (natural faculties) disprove it? All about you it teeming with life, and life comes from the use of your rights." Here is where faith should have played the important part: faith in God's word. Eve pondered. The evidence of the eyes did seem to contradict the threat of God. Again it is the age-old balancing of the natural against the supernatural. And Eve began to weaken. She forgot the command of God, and desired to anticipate the use of her natural faculties. With the nagging complaint of a Rachel, she approached Adam: "Give me children or I die."

THE FALL

To Adam the command of God was clear. He could not be tempted to transgress it from any inner concupiscence. Only from without can he be induced to do so. And it was from the woman whom he loved that the temptation came. He succumbed. He loved her more than he loved God and God's promises. Adam and Eve anticipated the use of their generative faculties, thus positively disobeying God's precept to abstain from using them for the time of probation. This was a transgression of a positive divine law,

not a sin against their natures. It was formally a sin of pride and disobedience, and only a sin of the flesh in as far as temporal chastity was the injunction of the Most High. Hence, the above hypothesis differs entirely from that of those Protestants who state that the sin of our first parents was one of concupiscence and sexual indulgence.

Adam and Eve preferred the act of nature to the supernatural fruit which would have been theirs had they been willing to forego the act of nature for a time. It was against this supernatural aspect of the marital act that they rebelled, and hence their sin is a sin that deprived them of supernatural grace and other gifts, at the same time depriving their offspring of the same benefits. What God intended to be a vehicle of supernatural life is now a vehicle abused, a vehicle vitiated in regard to the object intended by God; hence, even though it remains the means of procuring natural (physical) life, it bears the stamp of being deprived of something that God intended it to have. This privation brings with it the lack of grace in the newly conceived child. Men are conceived and born, deprived of what God had intended to be theirs. They are born deprived of divine sonship.

Well did Satan strike! Clever was his move. Pride and sexuality has showed itself in all of Adam's descendants down the ages in a steady stream of human beings, who prefer their own immediate enjoyment to the far greater goods proposed by the principles of reason and the dictates of faith.

THE PUNISHMENT

In line with this proposal it is not surprising that Eve's punishment did not involve sight (on account of the misuse of her eyes) or touch (the misuse of her hands) or taste (tasting the fruit), but the pangs of childbirth, to remind her constantly of her transgression and induce her to do penance. The punishment would be beneficial to all the daughters of men and lead them to a proper esteem of God's commands. As to Adam, he was likewise punished in line with his sin: namely, in the rebellion (disobedience) of his lower nature, in that he does not have full control of himself in that respect. It is to remind him of what God intended and what his own free will brought about. The shame and confusion experienced by all the sons of men will be beneficial

in teaching them to learn proper control. Adam and Eve were further punished in the rebellion of the first fruit of their loins, in that Cain rose up against the gentle Abel and slew him, manifesting the murderous designs of Satan of whom he was born (*I John* 3:12).

RECAPITULATION

In the fullness of time, God realized His plan to perfection. The new Adam of the regenerated race was a virgin and ever remained one. He was born of a virgin, who in turn became the new Eve and the Virgin-Mother of the children of God. Jesus and Mary, although virginal in every respect, are the new progenitors of the race of God. In Baptism men are born anew of the Virgin-Mother and the Spirit,[7] engrafted into the virginal Mystical Body of Christ, for that which is born of the flesh is flesh, but that which is born of the Spirit is spirit (*John* 3:6).

Even the Old Testament is not without witness to the manner of Adam's sinning. Why does God choose circumcision as the sign of the covenant with Abraham? Circumcision was long in vogue before Abraham, but God chose it as a sign of the supernatural. By it men again became members of God's family, sons of God, and partakers of His grace.[8] God's purpose of choosing precisely that sign in the flesh of Abraham's foreskin is made known in *Deut.* 10:12-16. It was to be a reminder that the heart's desires were to be kept in control, the passions subdued. Thus again we see the original idea shining through. God's people are to use their generative powers with proper control and proper restraint. Where Adam failed, Abraham's descendants were to be victorious. The removal of the foreskin (circumcision) was to be a constant reminder.

Truly, the efficacy of this sign of the covenant flowed from the merits of the future redeemer and the new Eve,[9] who pre-

[7] The symbolism of *John* 3:5 is given by the present writer in *CBQ*, XIV (1952), 116-23.

[8] Theologians call the rite of circumcision in Israel a "quasi-sacrament" by which sanctifying grace was conferred in view of the merits of the coming Redeemer.

[9] As the first Adam and the first Eve brought about the loss of grace for mankind, so God willed that grace be restored to men through the combined efforts of the Second Adam and the New Eve. Just how Mary is involved

ferred the hard wood of the tree to the enjoyment of its fruit, and the complete holocaust of their will and desires in preference to anything which those two perfect natures could have claimed. As Holy Church sings: The devil overcame by the tree, but he in turn was also overcome by the tree (Preface of the Cross). Adam and Eve sinned by the willful preference of their natures to grace, but the New Adam and the New Eve triumphed by the willful submission of their wills to God's plan, and the complete holocaust of nature in the workings of divine love. It is the human natures of Jesus and Mary that have become the highest vehicle of divine grace for the entire race of men.

TWO OBJECTIONS FORESTALLED

The fact that Christ raised matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament does not conflict with the proposal as given above. The use of the generative faculties can be a good and meritorious act in God's sight, but not on that account does that act regain the purpose intended by God in the beginning. Hence, with regard to the intended vehicle of divine grace to be communicated to progeny, it is still a vitiated act. With regard to individual merit, it is good and meritorious, depending on the intention of the individual. Even after the institution of the sacrament of matrimony, children must be born again in the regenerative waters of baptism, else they are not rid of original sin.

---

as Co-Redemptrix is much discussed today. See E. B. Gallagher, S.J., "Evaluation of the Arguments in Favor of Mary's Co-Redemption," in *Marian Studies,* II (1951), 107-28. ". . . when we speak of Mary's Co-redemption, we mean the doctrine which teaches that Our Blessed Lady, by her moral acts, formally co-operated immediately, proximately, and directly in the work of the objective Redemption. Together with Christ, but dependently on Him and only *de congruo,* according to this doctrine, she paid the ransom-price by which satisfaction was made to God for all men, and the possibility of salvation was restored to all men, consequently to the fall of the race in Adam. Our reacquired possibility of salvation is thus declared to be due both to the condign *'meritum semel acquisitum'* of Christ, and to an accompanying congruous *'meritum semel acquisitum'* of Mary in the very work of objective Redemption" (p. 107). Pope Pius XII wrote: "Are not Jesus and Mary the two sublime loves of the Christian people? Are they not the New Adam and the New Eve whom the tree of the Cross unites in sorrow and in love to offer reparation for the guilt of our first parents in Eden?" (*L'Osservatore Romano,* April 22-23, 1940).

This proposal prescinds from the evolutionary hypothesis of the origin of man's body. Yet it fits in with that hypothesis very well, whether one prefers to place the transition of animal to human nature in the adult state or in the embryonic state. In both cases, that unique individual "man" is surrounded by the irrational "brute." In every case the rational human being must first of all learn to subject his animal inclinations to right reason, and learn to control the use of his faculties according to God's will. With man elevated to the supernatural, revelation and faith enter in. Man is requested to subject himself to God's will in regard to the object of faith, namely to obey God's revealed injunctions. The above proposal dealt with one of God's injunctions. It was a further restriction and control of man's nature, this time for a set period, and with a higher end in view. Thus it is clear that the proposal is right in line with God's training of His creature "man" for the higher grades of perfection for which He had created him and to which He had called him.[10] It is the paradoxical principle of giving up in order to receive still more. The parable of the grain of wheat, the message of the Cross. *"Fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum!" Non sicut ego volo, sed sicut tu."*

BERNARD J. LEFROIS, S.V.D.

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Vigan, Ilocos Sur, Philippines

[10] The hypothesis developed in this article is briefly mentioned in the recently published book of C. Hauret, *Beginnings: Genesis and Modern Science* (Dubuque, 1955), pp. 162-70, yet many angles have been left untouched which deserve consideration. It is also interesting to note that Tob. 6:18 (see 8:8-9) is entirely in line with our proposal.

CATHOLICS IN COLONIAL AMERICA

Part III

A decade before the exclusion of the proprietor had ushered in the darkest years for the Catholics of Maryland a new colony had begun to form immediately to the north. The persecution that William Penn had already undergone for his Quaker faith prompted him in 1681 to launch his "holy experiment" with a broad grant of freedom of worship and civil rights to all who believed in God. But this was far too liberal for the taste of the English government and after a long and unsuccessful struggle the assembly of Pennsylvania was forced in 1705 to legalize all the religious tests demanded by London. In this way the Catholics, Jews, and Unitarians lost their original liberties. But the mild character of the Quaker regime attracted the religiously oppressed and a number of Maryland Catholic families moved northward. In 1706 the Jesuits likewise acquired land in Cecil County near the Pennsylvania border where they opened St. Xavier Mission at what came to be called Bohemia Manor, and where they had a school in the mid-eighteenth century to which the sons of the Catholic gentry went to receive the elements of learning. From this center the priests from time to time made trips into the neighboring Pennsylvania and Delaware, and it was probably one of these who was a cause for concern in both London and Philadelphia when Penn told his deputy, James Logan, in 1780, "Here is a complaint against your Government, that you suffer publick Mass in a scandalous manner. Pray send the matter of fact, for ill use is made of it against us here."[48]

But the Quaker officials did nothing to disturb the Catholics either then or later and the entire colonial period passed in Pennsylvania without any kind of penal legislation such as had been enacted against the Catholics in Maryland. Under these circumstances it was quite natural that the Jesuits should direct their

[48] Penn to Logan, July 29, 1708, Deborah Logan and Edward Armstrong (Eds.), "Correspondence between William Penn and James Logan . . . 1700-1750," *Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania,* X (1872), 294.

efforts more toward Pennsylvania, and about 1734 we hear of the first resident priest in the colony when Fr. Joseph Greaton opened a chapel in Philadelphia. Soon other missionaries appeared and after Fr. Henry Neale had been there for some months he told the English provincial in April, 1741, "We have at present all liberty imaginable in the exercise of our business, and are not only esteemed, but reverenced, as I may say, by the better sort of people."[49] About this time the Jesuits were made the beneficiaries of several large bequests from wealthy English Catholic families and with this money they were able to expand their Pennsylvania activities. From the outset, however, the great majority of the Catholics in the colony were German immigrants, mostly from the Palatinate, who were anxious to have priests of their own nationality. Application was, therefore, made to the General of the Jesuits and as a result in 1741 there arrived two German Jesuits, Theodore Schneider and William Wappeler, who immediately undertook the care of the German Catholics. As the number of Germans increased they moved westward from Philadelphia where they established thriving rural communities around Goshenhoppen, Conewago, and Lancaster. Before the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773 eight more German Jesuits came to supplement the efforts of Schneider and Wappeler and by the time of the Revolution the German families and their descendants, to whom these priests ministered, had become one of the most flourishing groups of Catholics in colonial America.

There was only one brief period of serious tension experienced by the Catholics of colonial Pennsylvania and that was related to the renewal of war between England and France. However, long before war was formally declared by the two powers in June, 1756, preparations had been building up at a number of places along the vague frontiers of their neighboring empires in North America. One of the sensitive spots was Acadia where the French-speaking Catholic inhabitants, who had been under British rule since the cession of their province in 1713, were naturally more sympathetic to France than they were to its rival. In this case England decided upon a drastic measure to eliminate the difficulty and between No-

[49] Neale to Charles Shireburn, S.J., April 25, 1741. Thomas Hughes, S.J. (Ed.), *History of the Society of Jesus in North America. Documents* (Cleveland, 1908), I, 342.

vember, 1755, and August, 1756, the six thousand or more Acadians were herded on board British ships and distributed in the English colonies along the coast from Massachusetts to Georgia.[50] In many instances families were broken up and in every respect it was one of the truly pathetic chapters in American colonial history. In none of the colonies were the exiles welcomed and in all their religion was one of the principal grievances against them. In Massachusetts Bay these unfortunate people found their staunchest friend in Thomas Hutchinson, the future governor, who did all he could to alleviate their plight. Concerning the Acadians' religion Hutchinson remarked:

> The people of New England had more just notions of toleration than their ancestors, and no exception was taken to their prayers in their families, in their own way, which, I believe, they practised in general, and sometimes they assembled several families together; but the people would upon no terms have consented to the publick exercise of religious worship by Roman catholick priests.[51]

Regardless of where they were landed the Acadians' lot was a hard one, although the 454 exiles who reached Pennsylvania in November, 1755, fared better than their brothers elsewhere.[52] The arrival of these French-speaking Catholics in the province, coming four months after the humiliating defeat which the French had inflicted on Braddock's army near Fort Duquesne, only heightened the suspicion and dislike of the newcomers. Moreover, the French and their Indian allies pressed their advantage with devastating

[50] The most recent scholarly account of the Acadian exiles is that of Lawrence Henry Gipson, *The Great War for the Empire. The Years of Defeat, 1754-1757* (New York, 1946), pp. 243-344.

[51] Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts-Bay*, edited by Lawrence Shaw Mayo (Cambridge, 1936), III, 30-31. Referring to the law of June, 1700, against priests in Massachusetts, Hutchinson added, "A law remained unrepealed, though it is to be hoped it would never have been executed, which made it a capital offence in such persons to come within the province" (III, 31).

[52] Although the government did not do anything for them, Anthony Benezet, a leading Quaker, organized a relief fund as did Fr. Robert Harding, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, and during the following five years a sum of nearly 7,000 pounds was disbursed in this way for the maintenance of the Acadians. Cf. Joseph L. J. Kirlin, *Catholicity in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1909), p. 84.

attacks against the frontier settlements which entailed grave losses in both lives and property.

In an atmosphere such as this it was not surprising that a kind of frenzy of fear should have overtaken the colonies in general. In Maryland, where as early as May, 1751, an official inquiry had been launched concerning the increase of Catholics, bills were introduced for the confiscation of the Jesuit properties, for a double tax on Catholics, and for denying them the right to inherit property. And in the autumn of 1756 two Jesuits, James Beadnall and Benedict Neale, were arrested and brought to trial. Although the upper house of the assembly killed the legislation and the Jesuits were acquitted, the threats to Catholic interests were so real that Charles Carroll of Annapolis, father of the signer, and others seriously considered moving to Louisiana.

Matters did not go nearly so far in Pennsylvania, but in 1756 a "popish plot" was concocted on the basis of forged correspondence which purported to show that the priests and their charges were flirting with the French. In early July the Governor of New York made it the subject of a letter to Governor Robert H. Morris of Pennsylvania in which he said, "I am rather inclined to think, the treasonable correspondence must have been carried on by some Roman Catholics. I have heard you have an ingenious Jesuit in Philadelphia."[53] For months the Catholics were subjected to ugly threats and harsh names by Protestant agitators whose dislike of Quaker tolerance of the papists inspired them to issue public charges that the government's mildness was endangering the province. A few of the Acadians, it is true, gave some reason for alarm by affirming loyalty to their French nationality. As a consequence five of the leaders were arrested and expelled from Pennsylvania in the spring of 1757, although upon a promise of good behavior they won their way back the following year.[54] Meanwhile the Quakers refused to be stampeded into any infringement of their principles of religious tolerance and justice by those who were crying for revenge upon the Catholics. An official investigation was conducted into the treasonable charges, but when no evidence of the guilt of the Catholics was uncovered the charges were dis-

[53] Sir Charles Hardy to Morris, July 9, 1756, Samuel Hazard (Ed.), *Pennsylvania Archives* [First Series] (Philadelphia, 1853), II, 694.

[54] Gipson, *op. cit.*, pp. 315-16.

missed by the government and Fr. Robert Harding, the "ingenious Jesuit," and his little flock in Philadelphia gradually resumed the even tenor of their ways.

One of the indirect results of the war scare was a census of the Pennsylvania population which was taken on the initiative of the Earl of Loudoun, the commander-in-chief of all the British forces in North America, with a view to determining the number of men capable of bearing arms. The total population of the colony was found to be about 200,000. Of this number the four Jesuits in charge of the Pennsylvania congregations reported in April, 1757, that there were in all 1,365 Catholics, of whom 949 were Germans and the remaining 416 were English, Irish, or native Americans. Of the total, 378 Catholics resided in or about Philadelphia while the others lived in the counties.[55] Thus in the years before the Revolution Pennsylvania Catholicism was largely a rural phenomenon, a condition which would undergo a sharp change in the following century. In Maryland, of course, Catholics were even more concentrated in the countryside since there were no towns the size of Philadelphia and there were practically no Catholics in Annapolis, the colonial capital. The largest single increase of Catholics in the colonies was due to the 6,000 Acadians, but by reason of the fact that many of them were so widely dispersed that they were lost to the Church for lack of priestly ministrations and, too, that many others found their way back to Canada, the addition to the Catholic body was not what it would otherwise have been. Yet some of these exiles settled down in Philadelphia and in the rural areas of Pennsylvania and Maryland, and they were included in the figures for the Catholic population which Fr. George Hunter submitted in July, 1765, to the English provincial. At that time he stated that in Maryland there were about 10,000 "adult Customers" and nearly as many children who had not been admitted to the sacraments, while in Pennsylvania he counted around 3,000 adults with approximately an equal number of children.[56]

Of Catholics in the other eleven colonies relatively little was known by the Jesuit missionaries, and that for the very good reason

[55] "A List of All the Roman Catholicks in Pennsylvania, 1759," *Pennsylvania Archives* (Philadelphia, 1853), III, 144-45.

[56] Hunter to John Dennett, S.J., July 23, 1765, Hughes, *op. cit., Documents,* I, 335-38; 351-52.

that there were few if any living there. Now and then, it is true, a Catholic name had appeared in those regions, but aside from a few stray Catholics in northern Virginia, Abenaki Indians in Maine, and the special case of Fr. Gabriel Druillettes' visit to Massachusetts Bay in 1650 on a diplomatic mission for New France, the only other colony that saw them in any numbers—and that only for a few years—was New York.

It was in September, 1609, that Henry Hudson, an English mariner in the employ of the Dutch East India Company, headed the *Half Moon* into what is today New York harbor and followed the river that bears his name as far north as the present site of Albany. On the basis of this claim the Dutch founded the colony of New Netherlands whose charter of "Freedom and Exemptions" in 1640 declared that "no other Religion shall be publicly admitted in New Netherland except the Reformed. . . ."[57] Yet the Dutch were not without sympathy for the oppressed of other religions, and when Isaac Jogues, S.J., mangled by over a year of torture at the hands of the Mohawk and Iroquois Indians, was rescued by their men at Fort Orange and brought to New Amsterdam in the fall of 1643, he was generously treated by Governor William Kieft and Johannes Megapolensis, the leading dominie, who had renounced Catholicism for the Calvinist faith. Jogues found only two Catholics in the town, the Portuguese wife of an ensign and an Irishman who had come up from Virginia. Such remained the situation during the period of Dutch rule. In March, 1664, however, Charles II, with an eye to encompassing England's rival, gave an immense grant to his brother James, Duke of York, which included the Dutch colony, and in August of that year the English made a speedy conquest of New Netherlands. A brighter prospect now opened for Catholic settlement among the ten thousand inhabitants of the newly named New York.

In 1672 the royal proprietor, the future James II, became a Catholic and two years later he issued instructions to Governor Edmund Andros that people of all religions were to be allowed to settle within the province. That the duke had in mind his own coreligionists was true, for at the time the current was once more

[57] Edward T. Corwin (Ed.), *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York* (Albany, 1901), I, 130. For the period of Dutch rule cf. Frederick J. Zwierlein, *Religion in New Netherland* (Rochester, 1910).

running strongly against the Catholics in England. In March, 1673, parliament had passed the Test Act which demanded of all office holders an oath containing an explicit denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation. But it was not until a decade later that there were enough Catholics in New York to derive any benefit from the duke's liberality. The proprietor was aware of the growing threat from the French on the borders of his colony, and that was in all likelihood in his mind when he consulted with the English Jesuits about establishing a mission. They might, indeed, prove an effective counterbalance to the activities of their French confrères in northern New York. In 1682 he appointed Colonel Thomas Dongan, son of an Irish baronet, as governor and when the latter reached New York in August, 1683, there was with him Fr. Thomas Harvey, an English Jesuit, who was later joined by two other priests and two lay brothers of his order.

From the outset of English rule one of the most persistent complaints of the colonists had been the lack of a representative assembly. In the early years the Duke of York had refused to respond to these petitions, but the discontent having assumed somewhat serious proportions, he took the occasion of the change in governors to empower Dongan in September, 1682, to call an assembly. Dongan was an administrator of marked ability and after two months in the colony he summoned an assembly and stood sponsor for the bill of rights which it adopted in late October, 1683. This "Charter of Libertys and Privileges" contained a guarantee of religious freedom which read in part as follows:

> . . . that no person or persons, which profess faith in God by Jesus Christ, shall at any time, be any ways molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question for any difference in opinion or matter of religious concernment, who do not actually disturb the civill peace of the Province, but that all and every such person or persons may, from time, and at all times freely have and fully enjoy his or their judgments or consciences in matters of religion throughout all the Province, they behaving themselves peaceably and quietly and not using this liberty to Licentiousnesse nor to the civill injury or outward disturbance of others. . . .[58]

---

[58] *Ibid.*, II, 864.

Thus New York's Catholic governor joined the honorable company of Roger Williams, Lord Baltimore, and William Penn as the chief promoters of religious toleration in colonial America.

For the remainder of Governor Dongan's term of office religious matters centered largely around the government's relations to the individual churches. The various denominations had their respective houses of worship, and the little Catholic chapel in Fort James was staffed by the Jesuits who ministered to the relatively few Catholic families. The priests also opened a school which was attended by the sons of the leaders of the colony, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. Dongan was hopeful that in time the Jesuits might likewise do missionary work among the Indians to the north since from the beginning one of his principal policies had been a vigorous defense of England's interests against the French and their Indian allies. Good Catholic that he was, the governor did not hesitate to oppose for political reasons the extension of the efforts of the French Jesuits into an area which he felt rightfully belonged to the British crown. The turn of events, however, did not permit the English Jesuits to implement his policy regarding the New York Indians.

It was in connection with this same policy that there came about indirectly the replacement of Dongan as governor. He had recommended to the home government a greater consolidation of the colonies in the belief that it would offer a more effective resistance to the French. King James II was won to the idea and in April, 1688, he created the Dominion of New England, embracing New York and the Jerseys, and he put Sir Edmund Andros in control of the combined colonies. But the new administration, unpopular from the outset, had little time to be tested for within a few months James II lost his throne and changes of a revolutionary nature followed in both England and the colonies. In these changes no one suffered more than the Catholics. We have already seen what they meant to the Catholics of Maryland and Pennsylvania, and in New York a German-born Calvinist, Jacob Leisler, led a rebellion in May, 1689, which inaugurated a reign of terror against the Catholics. Thomas Dongan, the former governor, was hunted like a traitor, the Jesuits were compelled to flee to escape Leisler's wrath, and the principle of religious toleration was quickly abrogated so that Catholics were barred from office and the franchise.

For them, Leisler was to New York what the notorious John Coode, who a few weeks after Leisler's rebellion overthrew by violence the government of the Calverts, was to Maryland.

In both colonies once the laws of religious toleration had been repealed and the Church of England men had gained the ascendancy, they established that body as the state church. It was in 1692 that this was accomplished in Maryland and in September, 1693, a bill made it the established church in four of the leading counties of New York. From this time on to the Revolution there was no peace for any Catholics who had the hardihood to appear in that colony. The temper of affairs during the eighteenth century can be gauged by the act of 1700 which made it a crime for a priest to be found in New York and imposed a fine of 250 pounds on anyone who harbored a priest. Forty years later the fanatical hatred of Catholicism was injected into the scare over an alleged plot of some Negro slaves. As a consequence the Reverend John Ury, a non-juring Anglican clergyman, was accused of being a priest in disguise and was hanged on Aug. 15, 1741, while nearly thirty Negroes were either hanged or burned at the stake.[59]

With the exception of a small Maryland mission of the English Franciscans which lasted from 1673 to 1720, and an occasional priest who appeared at intervals in other colonies, the religious ministrations of the colonial Catholics were entirely in the hands of the Jesuits. From the arrival of Fathers White and Altham in March, 1634, to the suppression of the Society of Jesus by Pope Clement XIV in August, 1773, there were 186 members of this order who worked on the American missions, of whom eleven were American-born.[60] Since the Catholic hierarchy of England had become extinct in 1585 with the death of Thomas Goldwell, Bishop

[59] Cf. Martin I. J. Griffin (Ed.), "The Trial of John Ury," *American Catholic Historical Researches,* XVI (January, 1899), 2-58.

[60] Hughes, *op. cit., Text,* II, 676-704, lists these men with brief biographical data. There were twenty-six other American-born Jesuits who either were never assigned to the colonies or who were overtaken by the suppression of 1773. Of the 186 Jesuits who worked in the English colonies the large majority were native Englishmen, although in the years after 1741 there were ten German-born Jesuits who were on the missions, mostly in Pennsylvania. By way of contrast a total of 496 priests saw service in the colony of New France between 1611 and 1760 of whom 156 were Canadian-born while the remaining 340 had come out from France. Wade, *op. cit.,* pp. 38-39.

of St. Asaph, it had been necessary in the early years for these priests to get their faculties from the Congregation of Propaganda Fide through the office of the Jesuit general. However, in January, 1688, Innocent XI erected three new vicariates apostolic in England, and from that date to the close of the American Revolution it was the Vicar Apostolic of the London District who had jurisdiction over the Church in the colonies. But the new bishops were consecrated only a few months when the Catholic James II lost his throne and thereafter it became exceedingly difficult for Bishop John Leyburn and his successors in London to function for their English subjects, to say nothing of exercising jurisdiction over the distant American colonists. In fact, from the Protestant triumph of 1688 to the end of the eighteenth century the vicars apostolic, the priests, and the Catholic laity of England were harassed unmercifully.[61] Under the circumstances it was not strange that the authority wielded over the Catholics in the colonies should have been a very shadowy one. For the most part it was reduced to granting occasional faculties and dispensations when the missionaries made application for them. For example, the Jesuits who had charge of the management of the Maryland plantations of their society found that the very large number of holy days on which the law of the Church forbade servile labor seriously interfered with the sowing and harvesting of the crops by their tenants and farm hands. Consequently they applied to Bishop Bonaventure Giffard to have the number of holy days reduced. In December, 1722, Giffard complied with the request and issued a dispensation from the law for all holy days between May and October with the exception of four of the principal feasts.[62]

[61] An example of the harshness of life imposed upon them was seen in a letter which Bishop Bonaventure Giffard, the Vicar Apostolic of the London District, wrote to a friend at Rome in 1714. He said, "Since May 4, I have had no quiet. I have been forced to change lodgings fourteen times, and but once have I lain in my own lodgings. . . . I may say, with the apostle, 'in carceribus abundantius.' In one I lay on the floor a considerable time; in Newgate almost two years; afterwards in Hertford gaol; and now daily expect a fourth prison to end my life in. . . . The continual fears and alarms we are under is something worse than Newgate. It is also some mortification for an old man, now seventy-two, to be so often hurried from place to place. God grant me eternal rest!" quoted in Wilfrid Ward, *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (New York, 1898), I, 187-89.

[62] Shea, *op. cit.*, I, 374-75.

No one pretended that the government of the colonial Church was a normal or satisfactory one, but under the conditions then prevailing in both England and America there was not much of an alternative. From time to time the Holy See requested information on the American missions and in 1756 the Roman authorities sought a clarification of their status. At the time Bishop Richard Challoner was the responsible official in London, and in a letter to Dr. Christopher Stonor, agent of the English bishops at Rome, he stated that all of England's American colonies had been deemed subject to the London vicariate. But he revealed how incomplete his information was when he said:

> I know not the origin of this, nor have ever met with the original grant. I suppose they were looked upon as appurtenances or appendixes of the English Mission. And, after the division of this kingdom into four districts, the jurisdiction over the Catholicks in those settlements has followed the London district. . . . I suppose because London is the capital of the British Empire; and from hence are the most frequent opportunities of a proper correspondence with all those settlements. Whether the Holy See has ordered anything in this regard, I cannot learn. . . .

Challoner likewise alluded to a desire expressed by some people that a bishop should be appointed for the colonies in order that the Sacrament of Confirmation might be conferred. He confessed his uncertainty as to the wisdom of this idea, and he added that it might not be pleasing to the Jesuit missionaries since it might, as he said, "give offense to the governing part there; who have been a little hard upon them of late years. . . ."[63]

It is, of course, always a normal part of Catholic life to have bishops to rule the Church and to administer the sacraments of confirmation and holy orders. But at a time when the American priests and laity were smarting under the anti-Catholic fury whipped up by the French and Indian War a bishop in the colonies would have been out of the question. Moreover, there were other reasons why the priests were not anxious to have a bishop come among them. One of these reasons related to the heritage of strained relations between the English bishops and secular clergy,

[63] Challoner to Stoner, Sept. 14, 1756, quoted in Edwin H. Burton, *The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner (1691-1781)* (New York, 1909), II, 126.

on the one hand, and the religious orders on the other. In the unnatural situation occasioned by the extinction of the hierarchy in the mother country the Jesuits and other religious had been for some years left virtually on their own. When the Holy See, in an effort to provide some kind of organized leadership, appointed in 1598 an archpriest from the secular clergy to govern until a bishop could be appointed for England the religious orders resented the action. The resentment became mutual and eventually led to a cleavage between the two groups of clergy that endured into the nineteenth century and that had its counterpart in America. In the colonies the Jesuits shared to a great extent the views of their English brethren. They were fearful, therefore, lest the coming of a bishop—for whom support would have to be furnished from some source—might endanger the security of their properties, and they were uneasy, too, over the very real possibility that his presence would stir the Protestants to further acts of hostility.

Since the Holy See, however, had the responsibility for the proper governing of all parts of the universal Church it was not content to let the matter rest entirely. At the end of the Seven Years' War, therefore, when most of France's colonies were ceded to Great Britain, the Congregation of Propaganda again raised the question of a bishop with Challoner. The London vicar apostolic was anxious to be relieved of the worry of America and in his reply of August, 1763, he urged that a bishop be appointed. Further delays ensued and in 1771 Propaganda turned to Bishop Joseph-Olivier Briand of Quebec in the hope that he might find a way to administer Confirmation in the colonies. Briand had little desire to make the journey and he, therefore, first asked a Canadian Jesuit, Bernard Well, to inquire of his confrères to the south as to how a bishop would be received. It was Fr. Ferdinand Farmer who replied from Philadelphia in April, 1773. Farmer emphasized that they would, indeed, very much like to receive the Sacrament of Confirmation, but he outlined the handicaps under which they were then living and stated that the very name of bishop was hateful to non-Catholics in all parts of the colonies, even to the Anglicans. He said:

> From the foregoing it is easy to see that the Catholic Religion is practised with far greater authority and freedom in Canada than in our own country. Wherefore it is most certain that the advent in our

midst of the Right Reverend and Illustrious [Bishop of Quebec] would create disturbances, with the danger of depriving us of the paltry privileges we are now enjoying. . . .[64]

It was hardly an inviting prospect for Briand if he wished to make the trip, which he did not. The clouds of conflict were even then gathering and as the Revolution approached talk of a bishop receded more and more into the background. Thus 156 years were to intervene between the coming of the Jesuits in 1634 and the appearance of the first American Catholic bishop in 1790. During all that time neither was there a bishop in residence nor did one visit the colonies to administer Confirmation to the Catholics. It was little wonder that they should scarcely have known what the episcopal office was, and that the prolonged character of this abnormal regime should have given rise, on the part of the American Catholics, to some strange ideas on the general subject of ecclesiastical government.

(To be continued)

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[64] Farmer to Bell, Philadelphia, April 22, 1773, *American Catholic Historical Researches,* XXI (July, 1904), 119.

Answers to Questions

THE PASTOR AND INVALIDLY MARRIED PARISHIONERS

Question: What obligation has a pastor toward those parishioners who are living in an invalid marriage?

Answer: A pastor undoubtedly has grave obligations toward parishioners involved in an invalid marriage. He would be guilty of neglecting his duty if he failed to do anything for them or argued that he can wait until they come to him with their problems. Our Lord expects him to go in search of these strayed sheep, even if they themselves do not seek his assistance. When he finds out that a couple living in his parish, one of whom (at least) is a Catholic, are not validly married, he should visit them and see what can be done to rectify the situation. There are thousands of Catholics in our land today living in invalid unions that could be validated (either through the fulfillment of the prescribed form or through a *sanatio*) if some zealous priest interested himself in them. In many such cases the non-Catholic party could be induced to make an honest study of the Church's claims, if the priest gave this person a kindly and straightforward talk. Of course, there are many other invalid unions that cannot be rectified, usually because of the impediment of a previous marriage bond. But even in such cases the pastor should not neglect the couple. He should not, indeed, make any compromise with the situation by treating the couple as a properly married pair, or by cloaking over the fact that they are living in sin and that as long as they continue to live as husband and wife their sin cannot be forgiven by God. But by fervent and kindly admonition he might be able to induce the couple to separate or (if the requisite conditions are present) to live as brother and sister. Even if he does not succeed to this extent, he should urge the couple to pray for divine help and mercy,

and let them know that as soon as they resolve to return to God, the way will be made as easy as possible.

MARRIAGE WITH DOUBTFUL IMPOTENCE

Question: Canon Law (Can. 1068, §2) rules that if there is doubt whether or not a person is impotent, marriage is not to be forbidden to him. How can this ruling be explained in view of the general principle that it is not permitted to confer a sacrament with doubtful matter?

Answer: The questioner does not state completely the principle of sacramental theology which he adduces as a difficulty to the prescription of Canon 1068, §2. It is true, *per se* it is forbidden to administer a sacrament with doubtful matter, for it is *per se* gravely irreverent to expose a sacramental rite to the danger of invalidity. But *per accidens* it is permitted to use doubtful matter—namely, when the reception of the sacrament is necessary or very useful, and certain matter cannot be procured. Thus, thin soup is doubtful matter for Baptism, and hence *per se* may not be used. But if an unbaptized infant is dying and no water is at hand, the soup could be used for a conditional administration of the sacrament—the obligation remaining of repeating the ceremony with water if this becomes possible (Cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis,* II, n. 46). The reason is that Baptism is necessary for the child's salvation, and it is a lesser evil to expose a sacrament to the danger of nullity than to allow the infant to die without attempting to baptize it.

Now, the remote matter of Matrimony is the conjugal right. Accordingly, when it is uncertain whether or not a person is impotent, he can present only doubtful matter for the sacrament. *Per se,* therefore, according to the general principle stated above, he should abstain from marriage. However, *per accidens* such a person may lawfully enter the conjugal state and attempt sexual intercourse until such time as it is established with certainty that he has been permanently impotent, at least from the time of the marriage. The reason is that the great spiritual and temporal benefits effected by marriage justify the risk of an invalid administration of the sacrament and of the performance of objectively sinful actions. The

Church has ever upheld the right of human beings to marry as a fundamental right, so that it is to be given precedence over the danger of material sins in the case described. This is an application of the principle of the double effect.

It should be added that for the lawfulness of the marriage contract the person who is doubtfully impotent must inform the other party of his condition. It would seem, too, that strictly speaking those who enter marriage in these circumstances should have a conditional intention of giving and receiving the sacrament (if it can be validly administered, a condition *de praesenti*), as is the case, for example, when Baptism is administered with doubtful matter. However, I believe that it is best for a priest not to insist on this point if he is assisting at the marriage of a couple in the situation visualized. For it is possible that they may be confused about the type of condition they are supposed to make, and perhaps will elicit a suspensive condition *de futuro*. In other words, they may intend to take each other as husband and wife only when it has been proved that the doubtfully impotent partner is sexually potent. In this event, their attempts at sexual intercourse in the meantime would certainly be illicit.

THE RECIPIENT OF AN ANONYMOUS LETTER

Question: What course of action should a superior take when he receives an anonymous letter accusing one of his subjects of some grave moral fault?

Answer: No prudent superior would ever regard an anonymous letter as furnishing sufficient proof that a person was guilty of the moral fault it attributes to him. Hence, any superior who would definitely accuse a person subject to him of wrongdoing or inflict punishment on him merely because of an accusation contained in an anonymous letter would be guilty of grave injustice. At most, a superior might be influenced by such a communication to the extent of exercising greater vigilance over the accused person; and this would be the prudent course if several anonymous letters of the same type came from different sources. Whether or not the superior should inform the accused person of the letter or letters is a problem that would depend on the particular circumstances of the case. At times the best procedure is to throw the letter away

and forget the whole affair. Generally speaking, persons who write anonymous letters are not to be trusted.

A VOW AS AN AID TO CHASTITY

Question: What is to be said of the practice, employed by some confessors, of advising young persons with a problem of purity to make a temporary vow of chastity (for a week or a month) binding under venial sin?

Answer: It would be impossible to give a general answer to this question. In some cases such a vow might be helpful; in other cases it might prove to be no deterrent of the bad habit, so that the only effect would be the addition of sins against religion (albeit venial) to sins against chastity. In the case of one who is most earnestly striving to overcome temptations, I believe the vow would be helpful, both because of the psychological effects, and because of the additional divine graces the vow would merit. I suggest that if a person takes such a vow, he should add some sanction, by promising to perform an act of self-denial in the event of a future lapse. However, I would not recommend a vow in the case of a young person who is not extraordinarily determined to rid himself of the bad habit. Unfortunately, there are many such persons nowadays—young men and women who, though they may manifest sufficient purpose of amendment to deserve absolution, are not sufficiently convinced of the appalling malice of mortal sin to battle their temptations with the full measure of their natural and supernatural abilities. The good confessor should try to rectify the attitude of a youth in this sad condition of mind and will.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

BLESSING WITH SIMPLE SIGN OF CROSS

Question: Is it necessary to make the sign of the cross once for each blessing that one has the faculties to bestow, or can all the blessings be given with one simple sign of the cross? For instance,

when I bless a rosary, is it sufficient for me to make one sign of the cross, or must I make one sign of the cross to bestow the Crozier blessings, another to bestow the Brigittine, another for the Papal, another for the death crucifix, another for the scapular medal, another to attach to the crucifix the indulgences for the Way of the Cross? Furthermore, can one bless several different kinds of religious articles (rosary, medal, statue, scapular) with only one sign of the cross?

Answer: "A priest who has faculties to bless various objects for each one of which the sign of the cross without a special formula is sufficient, can attach all these various blessings to the objects with one sign of the cross. He need not repeat the sign of the cross for each blessing, even though the objects to be blessed are of a different nature.

"Hence, it is sufficient to make one sign of the cross over rosaries, crucifixes and statues for the purpose of attaching to the rosaries the Crozier indulgence, to the crucifixes the indulgences of the Stations of the Cross, and to all these objects the Papal indulgences. An exception is made with regard to the scapular medal" (Bonzelet, *Pastoral Companion,* revised edition).

CANDLES AT SIDE ALTARS OR SHRINES

Question: Is it proper to light candles at the side altar in honor of Mary and Joseph when Mass is being offered at the main altar?

Answer: We have never seen legislation forbidding the candles to be lighted at side altars or shrines while Mass is being celebrated at the main altar. In fact it seems appropriate to have candles lighted at the Mary altar on a feast day of the Blessed Virgin while Mass is being celebrated. Our inquirer might be confused with the directive about lighted candles at side altars during exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. That directive reads "no candles may be left alight before statues or pictures during Benediction or at any time when the Blessed Sacrament is exposed. This does not apply to votive candles in side chapels or at shrines which are out of sight of the altar where Benediction is taking place."

DISTRIBUTION OF HOLY COMMUNION

Question: In the parish here where I am a curate we have a very large number of communions especially on the First Friday of the month. It is the custom for the pastor to say the seven o'clock Mass and for one of the curates to distribute communion during the Mass. The pastor in Mass vestments goes to the altar, gives the absolution and turns to the people with the ciborium for the "Domine non sum dignus" and then without giving Holy Communion to anyone (not even the server) he turns to the altar, putting down the ciborium. Then I or one of the curates, vested in surplice and stole, take the ciborium and distribute Holy Communion throughout the Mass, pausing only at the consecration. Sometimes the pastor finishes his Mass and goes to the sacristy and I am still distributing Holy Communion. Sometimes when there are a great number at communion he comes from the altar at the end of Mass—without giving again the absolution and helps distribute Holy Communion. It is my idea that the proper thing would be that I should come out, give the absolution, etc., and then when I am distributing Holy Communion to the people, the pastor will come out of the sacristy and start his Mass.

Answer: There is absolutely no justification for such a ceremony. Let the pastor distribute Holy Communion at the proper time of the Mass and one of the curates help him. In any event whether the pastor or curate is distributing Holy Communion outside of Mass as described by our inquirer, each one says the complete prayers before and after giving Holy Communion to the faithful.

COMMUNION PLATE AND CLOTH

Question: Is it still necessary to provide both the communion plate and the communion cloth? Who should hold the communion plate? Who carries it back to the altar?

Answer: All the most recent commentaries on ceremonies still insist on the decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments (March 26, 1929) that in addition to the linen communion cloth spread before the communicants a paten should be used. Father O'Connell directs that this communion plate may be held

by the communicant or the server. In a decision dated Oct. 28, 1930, the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments stated that the acolyte was not forbidden to carry the communion plate, provided he exercise care and not tilt it and lose the fragments. If the communicant, not the server, holds the communion paten, then the priest distributing Holy Communion carries it back to the altar for purification.

BREVIARY DIFFICULTIES

Question: (a) There was much discussion among my fellow priests as to whether we were obliged to double the antiphons on the Sunday of Advent when reciting the breviary. (b) My *Ordo* directed that on Saturday, December 22, the feast of St. Francis Xavier Cabrini, the second vespers were taken from the feast with a commemoration of the Sunday. Shortly before that, on the feast of the Immaculate Conception, December 8, the vespers of the feast were suppressed in favor of the second Sunday of Advent. I was not able to reconcile this and figured there must have been a mistake. (c) During Advent were we free to say a votive Mass on the days when the office of a saint, not a duplex, occurred?

Answer: (a) "The Simplification of the Rubrics" by Bugnini clears up this difficulty for us at once. The decree of March 23, 1955, clearly stated the following: "The Sundays hitherto celebrated under the semi-double rite are raised to the double rite; but the antiphons for the time being are not doubled." This would seem to indicate that further changes in the breviary are in the making. The comment to the excerpt from the decree is interesting. "The fact is that in the breviaries the antiphons on Sunday are only begun before the psalms. It would have been quite a nuisance if one had to keep turning the pages of the breviary to hunt up the entire antiphon at the end of the psalm. And let us note the adverb 'for the time being' (*interim*), which recurs often, and says clearly that the concern is with a temporary arrangement."

(b) There clearly was a mistake in the *Ordo* for December 22. The Sundays of Advent are now celebrated as doubles of the first class and they are preferred to every feast both in occurrence and concurrence. The *Ordo* was correct in suppressing the second ves-

pers of the Immaculate Conception in favor of the first vespers of the second Sunday of Advent. By the same token, the second vespers of the feast for December 22, a lesser ranking feast, should have yielded to the first vespers of the fourth Sunday of Advent.

(c) During the first three weeks of Advent when a simple feast or a ferial office occurs we are free to choose whatever Mass we wish and thus offer a votive Mass.

BIRETTA WORN AT MASS

Question: What is the obligation for the priest to wear the biretta for Mass?

Answer: The rubrics of the missal, "et facta reverentia Cruci, vel imagini illi, quae in Sacristia erit, capite cooperto accedit ad Altare . . ." specifically direct the priest as he approaches the altar for Mass to wear the biretta. O'Connell (*The Celebration of Mass,* p. 288) remarks the following: "The rubric explicitly orders him to go to the altar covered, and the contrary practice is an abuse. Even if the priest is to celebrate at an altar where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed he is to wear his biretta, removing it when he comes within sight of the Sacred Host."

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Analecta

Before considering the Holy Father's recent activities, especially his very significant Christmas message, it will be interesting as we open the account of a new year to review a few of the major acts of the Pope in 1956. Last year His Holiness received more than a million persons in audience, appropriately enough the last major one of the year to over a thousand Italian children. Among the more celebrated callers at the Vatican in 1956 were former President Harry Truman; Konrad Adenauer of West Germany; Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations; Admiral Lewis Strauss, chairman of the United States' Atomic Energy Commission; and President Sukarno of Indonesia. A list of his more important acts would have to include the beatification of Blessed Innocent XI, the three encyclical letters on the Hungarian problem, the encyclicals on the Sacred Heart and Sacred Music, the address to the International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy, the pronouncements to the sixth Week of Revision of Pastoral Practice, to the Seventh International Congress of Catholic Doctors, his decision on painless childbirth. These achievements and others show how fruitfully Pius XII spent the past year.

All will recall the attention registered in the secular press to Pius XII's widely covered Christmas message, delivered to the Cardinals in Italian on December 23. Like his other Christmas messages the 1956 address treated of broad principles for a just and enduring peace, but in this speech the Pontiff applied such principles to many of the most serious international problems of the day.

For the first time he discussed in detail the United Nations as arbiter of international problems and tensions, with clear suggestions for that body's more effective operation. In this address he again championed the cause of a united Europe which he said would have a good influence on Asia, Africa, and the Mid-East. The ever timely question of arms reduction came under his scope as well, this time with a strong endorsement of aerial photography as a practical check that such agreements were being honored by all. And in speaking of the conditions of a just war the Pope made

the strongest statement to come from the Vatican on conscientious objectors.

The Pope's treatment of the UN must be of especial interest to all. In spite of the defects now present in the UN His Holiness recognizes it as an important instrument of peace. "The program which is at the foundation of the United Nations is the realization of absolute values in the coexistence of peoples." To secure world peace the Pope stated that UN observers be given free access to all troubled areas. And should a member State refuse to admit such observers, all exercise of that country's rights within the UN should be denied it. So, too, in the Pope's mind, must the UN have the right and power—through an adequate police force—to intervene in every case where one nation invades another's soil.

But the Christmas message went even deeper than these practical suggestions. Our Holy Father pointed to the basic contradiction that tortures modern man and then resolved it in the light of the Catholic doctrines of the Incarnation, grace, and original sin. ". . . On the one hand, there is the confident expectation of modern man, fashioner and eyewitness of the 'second technical revolution,' that he can create a world of plenty, . . . a world freed from poverty and uncertainty. On the other hand, there is the bitter reality of the long years of grief and ruin, with the resulting fear—become greater in these last months—of not succeeding in founding even a mere modest beginning of harmony and lasting peace."

Such a tragic contradiction is the direct result of either of two current philosophies of man, each an example of "false realism," although directly opposed to one another: "systematic scepticism" and "gratuitous optimism" which denies original sin. Often in the address the Pope directs attention to the Infant in the manger Who alone provides the full answer to this riddle. "The origin, the nature, the destiny and the history of man are bound up in that Infant, in the very fact of His birth among us. His infant cries are like the account of our history, without the knowledge of which the nature of man would remain an impenetrable enigma." His Christmas message ends with a tribute to the people of Hungary and thanks to those who have shown mercy to this noble race.

Except for his blessing of the thousands gathered in St. Peter's Square the Pope spent a quiet Christmas. His midnight Mass was celebrated in his private chapel with only his personal entourage in

attendance. During the holidays the Pope permitted himself the happiness of exchanging gifts with his family, among them the only other living member of his immediate family, Donna Elizabetta Rossignani.

In a talk to 130 members of the Association of Catholic Teachers of Bavaria on January 3, the Pope stressed the proper formation of teachers. He took the occasion to insist on the state's duty to Catholics to secure the proper relations between Catholic parents and teachers, basing such relations on their mutual religious convictions and mentality. The background of his remarks was the present conflict in many parts of West Germany against the unification of Protestant and Catholic schools into state supported interdenominational schools where there is danger that religious training will not be given its proper place. The Pope noted the danger of subjecting children to teachers who are "indifferent, negative, and even hostile, toward the religious and moral convictions of the parents," and the injustice of compelling the parents to entrust the children to such teachers. Nor does the Catholic school fail to prepare its students for the duties of citizenship. "Where her contribution in this respect is concerned, We believe that the Catholic school can proudly stand up before whatever state authority there may be. . . ." For such reasons, the Pope concluded, the Church will always defend her own schools and insist on the proper formation of teachers who will serve in them.

In another recent address the Holy Father underlined the duty of all Catholic parents as educators of their children. Speaking on January 6 to the Italian Association for the Protection of Maternity and Infancy he deplored the fact that many parents are unprepared for this important function and that even those who are prepared are often seriously impeded in their duty by many social evils, e.g., mothers working outside the home, fathers drawing insufficient wages, disgraceful housing conditions. Parents fulfill their office as educators by providing their child with all things necessary for his healthy physical growth and for the full development of his mind and heart, the Pope said. In the early but most formative years, this training which will form fundamental attitude to be carried through life will come with the child's adaptation to his entire environments—his parents' attitudes, all he sees, hears, and feels about him.

The family as the first school of Christian life was also a theme of the Pope's radio address of December 17, 1956, to those assembled for the final session of the Eucharistic Congress at Caracas, Venezuela. All the efforts of the best educators will be wasted unless families co-operate in training young people to be strong Christians, the Pontiff said. In the same broadcast the Holy Father had a special message for the priests and seminarians of that area: "Undoubtedly, the Sacrament of the Altar is the principal means to know Jesus Christ, to understand fully the greatness of His Mission, and to feel impelled to offer oneself to continue it by means of the priesthood."

ROMAEUS W. O'BRIEN, O.CARM.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Book Reviews

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, U.S.A. Edited by Louis J. Putz, C.S.C. Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1956. Pp. xxiii+415. $5.95.

Much of the brilliance, much of the dynamism of the Catholic Church as it has developed and as it now exists in the United States, is blended into this symposium by twenty-four outstanding specialists. From the erudite introduction by Bishop Wright to the final essay, the reader will find a wealth of information concerning the history, organization, diversity and influence of the Catholic Church in America.

It is no small contribution to American Catholicism to make this information available between the covers of one handy volume. As Bishop Wright remarks, "Catholicism is in many ways the least well or, at least, accurately known of the myriad religions whose names are familiar to Americans" (p. xi). There is every reason to hope for an improvement in this regard if *Catholic Church, U. S. A.* receives wide circulation among those Americans to whom the Church in America remains an inexplicable and somewhat sinister unknown.

The book is divided into three parts. Part one presents the history and structure of the Church in America. It considers such topics as: "The History of the Catholic Church in the United States," "The Holy See and the Church in the United States"; also the financial and organizational aspects of the Church in addition to the parochial school system and the N. C. W. C. Part two considers the Church in various regions of the country: New England, The South, The Mid-West, etc. Part three attempts to outline the influence of the Church in such areas as: Labor, Religious Freedom, Racial Segregation, Liturgy and the Intellectual Life.

As the twenty-four essays represent the analysis of twenty-four individuals, it is impossible to give a comprehensive evaluation of the volume as a whole beyond saying that it is in the main competent, interesting and to a certain degree absorbing. We shall review several of the essays which may be of particular interest to readers of the *American Ecclesiastical Review.* We make no mention of Msgr. Ellis' "The American Catholic and the Intellectual Life" as this has received adequate review elsewhere (*AER,* CXXXV, 5 [Nov., 1956]).

Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., in "An Introduction to American Catholicism," characterized American Catholicism in three generalizations:

. . . first, Catholicism is not induced by American culture but is the exercised choice of the American Catholics; second, the American Catholic is activist rather than contemplative; third, America is propitious to religion and piety so that Catholicism has had a splendid opportunity to develop its own life, which it did in an American way (p. 19).

In the course of explaining these generalizations, Father Weigel explodes several myths concerning American Catholicism. It is not materialistic, not anti-intellectual, not devoted to the American way at the expense of the Catholic faith. Writing on these false accusations, Father Weigel is forceful, almost belligerent in tone. For example, speaking of the "many Europeans who uncritically believe that America is the incarnation of materialism . . . the proper home of the tawdry and the vulgar," he says: "Nothing is far (sic) from the truth than this conception of the United States, and it must be flatly said that the man who believes in such an idea is very ignorant" (p. 11). Perhaps such a tone flows from a very exasperation with having to answer over and over again the cavalier judgments passed upon American Catholicism by the casual European observer.

The author makes brief reference to the question of tolerance, stressing the areas of co-operation between Catholics and Protestants, insisting that this "never takes place on the plane of religion itself" (p. 6). In painting the picture of the American Catholic, living in harmony, and even admiration ("His love of religion makes him prefer to have his neighbor in some church rather than in no church at all") of his Protestant neighbor, Father Weigel has not really touched the complex problem which "tolerance" presents to the American Catholic. He may have, in fact, even distorted the true picture and made the American Catholic too "tolerant." Furthermore his final remark is not well calculated to insure harmony among Catholics themselves. For speaking of those whom he apparently views as ready to take objection to his remarks, he states: "This tolerance may be interpreted by some superficial observers as a diminished allegiance to Catholicism, though such an interpretation would be very wide of the mark. Catholic tolerance is caused by an exercise of charity rather than by a defect of faith" (p. 7). "Superficial observer" is perhaps to high a price to pay for disagreement here.

In the essay "The Holy See and the Church in the United States," Rev. Edward Ryan, S.J., summarizes the important relations between the Vatican and the American hierarchy since the time of Bishop Carroll. He pays tribute to the fierce devotion to the papacy which has characterized the American church from the beginning. Father Ryan has provided us with one of the most rewarding essays of the collection. We regret that he has accepted "Americanism" as an

historical phantom. Certainly that situation was never as serious as some Europeans maintained. Yet it seems unrealistic to refuse to admit that some American Churchmen may have had some small blame in the affair. While Father Ryan's approach may do little to dispel the suspicion that we in America are still not mature enough to admit we may have erred, the author no doubt felt that in an article of this type he could do no more than reflect the accepted attitude toward a question on which American Catholics have shown themselves so persistently sensitive.

Rev. John A. O'Brien increases his already significant contribution to American Catholic literature by authoring the essay "The Catholic Church and Religious Freedom." Persecution because of religious belief was unknown in the Catholic colony of Maryland, whereas it was quite common in the other colonies under Protestant influence. Moreover, the successive waves of bigotry which have swept America have been decidedly anti-Catholic and anti-Jewish. It is well to recall these facts today when we hear outraged cries against the "danger" which Catholicism poses to American religious freedom. The stains of religious persecution and bigotry on the fabric of our history have not been placed there by Catholics.

Included also in the same essay is a consideration of the origin, history, and scope of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Finally the author comes to the question of the relation between church and state. Unfortunately this important question is handled, we believe, rather badly. Father O'Brien calls attention to the magnificent progress the Church in America has made under the "wise provisions of separation of church and state." Then he concludes:

"In America we want no established Church, no privileged Church, but simply equal opportunity for all before the law. Nearly two centuries of experience have proven that religion is most vital and fruitful when its adherents believe in it and love it enough to support it out of their own free will offerings. A free Church in a free land is part of the American dream and we can share no other" (pp. 296-7). Father O'Brien is thus painstaking in giving strong (almost emotional) approval to the "wise provisions of separation of Church and State" in America without so much as a nod in the direction of the Catholic doctrine involved in this question. Failure to consider this doctrine which is known to Protestants and so antagonizes them, leaves the articles open to the charge of temporizing. Certainly it would be unfair to expect a complete theological discussion of this weighty matter, nevertheless to ignore this aspect completely may well serve to strengthen Protestant suspicions of Catholic aims in this regard and will do little to lessen the suspicion among European Catholics

that American Catholics can be more American only at the expense of being less Catholic. It would be unfair not to stress that the author speaks only of the present historical situation presented by the structure of the United States.

No one has any warrant to question the author's knowledge or firm acceptance of the Catholic doctrine relative to the church and state. We object only to the complete failure to include even a cursory exposition of this doctrine. We have a right to expect an article devoted to the question of religious freedom to consider not only the de facto separation of the church and state in America (with the concomitant prosperity accruing to the Church), but also to include an exposition and defense of the Catholic doctrine of church and state. To do less—and less has certainly been done here—may well suggest that there is a portion of Catholic doctrine which must be hidden from our Protestant neighbors lest they be offended; that there is a portion of Catholic doctrine which is, at least slightly, "un-American." The day is over when Catholics must defend their loyalty to their country; we wonder if the day is also past when our devotion to the "ideal of liberty" which is the "most distinctive contribution which America has made to the world" can be expressed only in terms of a less than integral statement and defense of the doctrine of Christ's Church.

Special notice should be taken of "The Catholic Church and Racial Segregation" by Rev. John La Farge, S.J., and "The Catholic Church and Labor" by Edward Marciniak. Both essays embody an informative historical summary of their topics and offer persuasive suggestions to insure continued progress in these areas.

With the reservations noted, this is a welcome addition to American Catholic literature. We think it a serious defect that the subjects of "Tolerance" and "Church-State Relations" received such brief and inadequate treatment. Others may well judge this defect to be less serious. At any rate *The Catholic Church, U. S. A.* should do much to illumine the structure of "the city set on a mountain." The more this City is known, the less will sincere Americans fear and oppose it; the more readily will they approach and find within it their true and lasting home. We must always be careful, however, to show them this City as it is, and not as we would have it be.

JOHN J. KING, O.M.I.

ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD. By John Bligh, S.J. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956. Pp. 189. $3.00.

In his preface Father Bligh sets forth his purpose. "The resulting book is not a pious meditation on the priesthood, but a liturgical and theological essay, written in the belief that a careful analysis of the

rite will in the end be more conducive to solid piety than a devotional treatment of the subject could be." Hence this very fine treatise on the ordination ceremony to the priesthood represents a great deal of research and study. It has been carefully pieced together step by step, and each phase of the ceremony is unfolded with its complete significance. The entire development is a most interesting one and should find interested readers among seminarians, priests and even the laity.

For the aspirant to the priesthood Father Bligh's book is a must because he unfolds every detail and meaning of the ceremony for this sacred calling. Not merely the ceremonies but especially the exhortations and prayers are beautifully explained.

For the priest this book can serve as an excellent reminder of the obligations he assumed when he consecrated his life to the service of God.

Many of the laity will find it enlightening in the development of certain features of the ordination ceremony. Just to mention one, "the kissing of the hands of the ordained" at the conclusion of the ceremony. Father Bligh explains in part that "the kissing of hands is of course a mark of respect for the sacrament of Orders and for the solemn consecration that has been imparted to the priest. . . . It is difficult to discover the history of the kissing of hands, since it is not strictly a part of the rite of ordination and is not mentioned in the Pontifical."

The reviewer was particularly pleased with Father Bligh's explanation of "matter" and "form" and his follow-up statement which reads: "The Decree Sacramentum Ordinis of 1947 was not a speculative document giving official confirmation to a point of doctrine established by historical research. Its purpose was practical. . . . It deliberately avoided saying what had been the matter and form in the period preceding 1947."

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

WORSHIP AND WORK. By Colman J. Barry, O.S.B. Collegeville, Minnesota: Saint John's Abbey, 1956. Pp. 447. $5.00.

Success stories always have a unique appeal; the history of St. John's Abbey in Minnesota is a success story *par excellence*. From a crude log dwelling on the western frontier, St. John's has become the world's largest monastery. Colman Barry, one of its monks, narrates the events of these years in his extremely readable book *Worship and Work*. This history of the religious growth of the Northwest gives us a vivid picture of the Church's progress in the late nineteenth century.

Under the leadership of six Abbots, St. John's has exercised a wide and strong influence. The first work of the young Benedictine com-

that American Catholics can be more American only at the expense of being less Catholic. It would be unfair not to stress that the author speaks only of the present historical situation presented by the structure of the United States.

No one has any warrant to question the author's knowledge or firm acceptance of the Catholic doctrine relative to the church and state. We object only to the complete failure to include even a cursory exposition of this doctrine. We have a right to expect an article devoted to the question of religious freedom to consider not only the de facto separation of the church and state in America (with the concomitant prosperity accruing to the Church), but also to include an exposition and defense of the Catholic doctrine of church and state. To do less—and less has certainly been done here—may well suggest that there is a portion of Catholic doctrine which must be hidden from our Protestant neighbors lest they be offended; that there is a portion of Catholic doctrine which is, at least slightly, "un-American." The day is over when Catholics must defend their loyalty to their country; we wonder if the day is also past when our devotion to the "ideal of liberty" which is the "most distinctive contribution which America has made to the world" can be expressed only in terms of a less than integral statement and defense of the doctrine of Christ's Church.

Special notice should be taken of "The Catholic Church and Racial Segregation" by Rev. John La Farge, S.J., and "The Catholic Church and Labor" by Edward Marciniak. Both essays embody an informative historical summary of their topics and offer persuasive suggestions to insure continued progress in these areas.

With the reservations noted, this is a welcome addition to American Catholic literature. We think it a serious defect that the subjects of "Tolerance" and "Church-State Relations" received such brief and inadequate treatment. Others may well judge this defect to be less serious. At any rate *The Catholic Church, U. S. A.* should do much to illumine the structure of "the city set on a mountain." The more this City is known, the less will sincere Americans fear and oppose it; the more readily will they approach and find within it their true and lasting home. We must always be careful, however, to show them this City as it is, and not as we would have it be.

JOHN J. KING, O.M.I.

ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD. By John Bligh, S.J. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956. Pp. 189. $3.00.

In his preface Father Bligh sets forth his purpose. "The resulting book is not a pious meditation on the priesthood, but a liturgical and theological essay, written in the belief that a careful analysis of the

rite will in the end be more conducive to solid piety than a devotional treatment of the subject could be." Hence this very fine treatise on the ordination ceremony to the priesthood represents a great deal of research and study. It has been carefully pieced together step by step, and each phase of the ceremony is unfolded with its complete significance. The entire development is a most interesting one and should find interested readers among seminarians, priests and even the laity.

For the aspirant to the priesthood Father Bligh's book is a must because he unfolds every detail and meaning of the ceremony for this sacred calling. Not merely the ceremonies but especially the exhortations and prayers are beautifully explained.

For the priest this book can serve as an excellent reminder of the obligations he assumed when he consecrated his life to the service of God.

Many of the laity will find it enlightening in the development of certain features of the ordination ceremony. Just to mention one, "the kissing of the hands of the ordained" at the conclusion of the ceremony. Father Bligh explains in part that "the kissing of hands is of course a mark of respect for the sacrament of Orders and for the solemn consecration that has been imparted to the priest. . . . It is difficult to discover the history of the kissing of hands, since it is not strictly a part of the rite of ordination and is not mentioned in the Pontifical."

The reviewer was particularly pleased with Father Bligh's explanation of "matter" and "form" and his follow-up statement which reads: "The Decree Sacramentum Ordinis of 1947 was not a speculative document giving official confirmation to a point of doctrine established by historical research. Its purpose was practical. . . . It deliberately avoided saying what had been the matter and form in the period preceding 1947."

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

WORSHIP AND WORK. By Colman J. Barry, O.S.B. Collegeville, Minnesota: Saint John's Abbey, 1956. Pp. 447. $5.00.

Success stories always have a unique appeal; the history of St. John's Abbey in Minnesota is a success story *par excellence*. From a crude log dwelling on the western frontier, St. John's has become the world's largest monastery. Colman Barry, one of its monks, narrates the events of these years in his extremely readable book *Worship and Work*. This history of the religious growth of the Northwest gives us a vivid picture of the Church's progress in the late nineteenth century.

Under the leadership of six Abbots, St. John's has exercised a wide and strong influence. The first work of the young Benedictine com-

munity was the spiritual care of the large German immigrant population that settled in Minnesota. In time the Missions supplied by priests from St. John's spread from Minnesota to North Dakota, Wisconsin, Oklahoma, Washington and New York. They had charge, too, of several Indian Missions and at one time operated a school for Indian children. The Seminary, College and Preparatory School at St. John's are well known and from their classrooms came the priests, teachers, and leaders of innumerable communities in the area. Perhaps the greatest single achievement of recent years was the inauguration of the Liturgical Movement as an organized effort under the guiding spirits of Abbot Alcuin Deutsch and Fr. Virgil Michel. Its publication, *Worship*, as well as the numerous books and pamphlets from the Liturgical Press, have done much to bring the Liturgy to the people. Finally, we see the influence of St. John's present in the foreign monastic foundations it started. The monasteries in Canada, Puerto Rico, Japan, Mexico and the Bahamas all owe their existence to the generosity and selfless labor of the monks from Minnesota.

St. John's history is well told. Colman Barry with enviable thoroughness presents the events of the past century in a mature and balanced manner. Frank and unbiased, he makes no effort to gloss over the less complimentary parts of the monastic history. Thus, the unfortunate controversy between Abbot Alexius Edelbrock and Fr. Othmar Erren is given in full. We meet real flesh and blood characters with human virtues and foibles. Every page evidences sound scholarship, and frequent allusions to contemporary events and the actual testimony of the principals involved give the reader a penetrating insight into the *milieu* of the situation.

Worship and Work records admirably the century of progress of St. John's Abbey. The author has done a splendid job and his work can be recommended to clergy and laity alike. This fascinating adventure of Benedictine monasticism in America makes enjoyable and profitable reading.

DOM PATRICK GRANFIELD, O.S.B.

MANUALE THEOLOGIAE DOGMATICAE. Vol. III. By P. Franc. Xav. de Abárzuza, O.F.M.Cap. Madrid-Buenos Aires: Ediciones Studium, 1956. Pp. XXIV + 652. Bound, pts. 150.

This second and enlarged edition of Fr. Xavier de Abárzuza's Dogmatic Theology retains the same logical method and clarity of style that were justly admired when it first appeared a few years ago. In addition, the text has been made more readable by the use of a better quality of paper and better selected types.

The third volume contains the following dogmatic treatises: *De Verbo Incarnato, De Beata Virgine Maria, De gratia Christi,* and *De virtutibus infusis.* Various questions of these four treatises have been brought up to date in this second edition, especially the Mariological questions: *De electione et praedestinatione B. Mariae Virginis in Matrem Dei;* Mary's *proximate* and *immediate* co-operation in the work of human Redemption; her death and Assumption, and her Queenship. In the tract *De gratia Christi,* the author has developed his opinion concerning the modality of the Divine Inhabitation of the Holy Spirit in the soul of the just. His opinion explains the new mode of Divine presence simply by the divine act that produces sanctifying grace at the moment of justification. This opinion does not differ much from that of Fr. G. Vasquez, S.J.

We recommend this text for seminary courses in theology, not only because it is more up to date than most of the texts now in use but also because it is clearer than many of them.

PASCAL P. PARENTÉ

Book Notes

One hundred years ago Fr. Frederick William Faber, the most lovable and in many ways the most brilliant of all the converts who came into the Church from the Oxford Movement, published his masterpiece, *The Foot of the Cross: The Sorrows of Mary.* Late last year The Peter Reilly Company of Philadelphia published a reprint of this book (pp. 406. $3.95). Previously this same company had republished Father Faber's *Bethlehem* (pp. 432. $3.95).

Father Faber was an enthusiast, and it was precisely by reason of his enthusiasm that some of his contemporaries objected to his conduct and his writings. His special value to the men of our own time is to be found in the fact that his enthusiasm characterized his love for the Triune God and for the Incarnate Word, and manifested itself in his affection for the Blessed Virgin and for the true Church of God over which she reigns as Queen. *The Foot of the Cross* begins with a long and inexpressably beautiful treatise on Our Lady's martyrdom. Seven chapters, each devoted to one of her sorrows, follow. The final chapter is composed of sections on her Compassion. Despite all that has been written during the intervening years, it would be difficult in the extreme to find a source from which the Catholic, and particularly the priest or religious, could derive an equally satisfactory appreciation of Our Lady's sufferings and of their glorious effects in the order of divine grace.

To an extent seldom equalled in the history of Catholic devotional literature, Father Faber was able to employ all the riches of scholastic theology to gain and to augment within himself an appreciation of the